This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UC-NRLF
B 3 944 189

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
HENRY DOUGLASS BACON.
1877.
Accessions No. 12737 Shelf No.



THE

WHOLE WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

IN TEN VOLUMES.

THE

WHOLE WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE:

WITH A LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

AND A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF HIS WRITINGS,

BY THE

RIGHT REV. REGINALD HEBER, D.D.,

LATE LORD BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

REVISED AND CORRECTED

BY THE REV. CHARLES PAGE EDEN, M.A.,

FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

EPISCOPACY—APOLOGY FOR SET FORMS—
REVERENCE DUE TO THE ALTAR—LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING—
CONFIRMATION.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS; F. AND J. RIVINGTON; HATCHARD AND SON; HAMILTON AND CO.; SIMPKIN AND CO.; CAPES AND SON; J. BAIN; E. HODGSON; H. WASHBOURNE; H. G. BOHN; BICKERS AND BUSH; J. VAN VOORST; C. DOLMAN. OXFORD: I. H. PARKER. CAMBRIDGE: J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON; MACMILLAN AND CO. LIVERPOOL: G. AND J. ROBINSON. BIRMINGHAM: H. C. LANGBRIDGE.

M DCCC XLIX.

BR 75
T26
v. 5

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

EPISCOPACY ASSERTED,

AND OTHER WORKS

ON

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

EPISCOPACY ASSERTED,

AND OTHER WORKS

ON

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

REVISED AND CORRECTED

BY THE REV. CHARLES PAGE EDEN, M.A.,

FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.



LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS; F. AND J. RIVINGTON; HATCHARD AND SON; HAMILTON AND CO.; SIMPKIN AND CO.; CAPES AND SON; J. BAIN; E. HODGSON; H. WASHBOURNE; H. G. BOHN; BICKERS AND BUSH; J. VAN VOORST; C. DOLMAN. OXFORD: I. H. PARKER. CAMBRIDGE: J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON; MACMILLAN AND CO. LIVERPOOL: G. AND J. ROBINSON BIRMINGHAM: H. C. LANGBRIDGE.

M DCCC XLIX.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Dedication to whole volume, fol. 1657 1
——— to treatise on Episcopacy 9

Of the sacred order and offices of episcopacy 13
§ 1. Christ did institute a government in His church . . 16
§ 2. This government was first committed to the apostles by Christ . 19
§ 3. — with a power of joining others, and appointing successors in the apostolate . . . . . *ib.*
§ 4. The succession into the ordinary office of apostolate is made by bishops 20
For the apostle and the bishop are all one in name and person . . 21
§ 5. — and office 23
§ 6. Which Christ himself hath made distinct from presbyters . . 24
§ 7. — giving to apostles a power to do some offices perpetually necessary, which to others He gave not 25
As of ordination . . . . . *ib.*
§ 8. — and confirmation 27
§ 9. — and superiority of jurisdiction 32
§ 10. So that bishops are successors in the office of apostleship according to the general tenent of antiquity 40
§ 11. — and particularly of S. Peter 42
§ 12. And the institution of episcopacy as well as the apostolate expressed to be divine by primitive authority 47
§ 13. In pursuance of the divine institution, the apostles did ordain bishops in several churches 50
— as S. James at Jerusalem . . . . . *ib.*
— S. Simeon to be his successor 53
§ 14. — S. Timothy at Ephesus 54
§ 15. — S. Titus at Crete 59
§ 16. — S. Mark at Alexandria 64
§ 17. — S. Linus and S. Clement at Rome 66
§ 18. — S. Polycarp at Smyrna; and divers others . . . *ib.*
§ 19. So that episcopacy is at least an apostolical ordinance, of the same authority with many other points generally believed . . 68
§ 20. And was an office of power and great authority . . . 70
§ 21. Not lessened by the assistance and counsel of presbyters . . *ib.*
§ 22. And all this hath been the faith and practice of christendom . . 82
§ 23. Who first distinguished names used before in common . . 83
§ 24. Appropriating the word *episcopus* or bishop to the supreme church officer 89

PAGE

§ 25. Calling the bishop and him only the *pastor* of the church . . 93
§ 26. — and *doctor* 95
§ 27. — and *pontifex* . . . . . *ib.*
— and *sacerdos ecclesiæ* 96
§ 28. And these were a distinct order from the rest 99
§ 29. To which the presbyterate was but a degree 101
§ 30. There being a peculiar manner of ordination to a bishopric . . 102
§ 31. To which presbyters never did assist by imposing hands . . 104
§ 32. For bishops had a power distinct and superior to that of presbyters . *ib.*
As of ordination 110
§ 33. — and confirmation 122
§ 34. — and jurisdiction 128
Which they expressed in attributes of authority and great power . . 129
§ 35. Requiring universal obedience to be given to bishops by clergy and laity 131
§ 36. Appointing them to be judges of the clergy and spiritual causes of the laity 135
§ 37. Forbidding presbyters to officiate without episcopal license . . 152
§ 38. Reserving church goods to episcopal dispensation . . . 159
§ 39. Forbidding presbyters to leave their own diocese or to travel without leave of the bishop 160
§ 40. And the bishop had power to prefer which of his clerks he pleased . 161
§ 41. Bishops only did vote in councils and neither presbyters nor people . 169
§ 42. And the bishop had a propriety in the persons of his clerks . . 175
§ 43. Their jurisdiction was over many congregations or parishes . . 176
§ 44. And was aided by presbyters but not impaired . . . 185
§ 45. So that the government of the church by bishops was believed necessary 192
§ 46. For they are schismatics that separate from their bishop . . 194
§ 47. — and heretics 196
§ 48. And bishops were always in the church men of great honour . 199
§ 49. And trusted with affairs of secular interest 207
§ 50. And therefore were enforced to delegate their power and put others in substitution 218
§ 51. But they were ever clergymen, for there never was any lay elders in any church office heard of in the church 220

APOLOGY FOR AUTHORIZED AND SET FORMS OF LITURGY.

Epistle dedicatory 229
Author's preface 231
A letter from Jeremy Taylor, D.D., addressed to bishop Leslie . . 255

An apology for authorized and set forms of liturgy 259
Question I. Of them that deny all set forms 261
Question II. Of them who deny set forms imposed by authority . 278

ON THE REVERENCE DUE TO THE ALTAR . . . 317

DISCOURSE OF THE LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING.

PAGE

Epistle dedicatory 341

A discourse on the liberty of prophesying, with its just limits and temper . 365

§ 1. Of the nature of faith, and that its duty is completed in believing the articles of the apostles' creed 368

§ 2. Of heresy and the nature of it; and that it is to be accounted according to the strict capacity of christian faith, and not in opinions speculative, nor ever to pious persons 378

§ 3. Of the difficulty and uncertainty of arguments from scripture in questions not simply necessary, not literally determined . . . 409

§ 4. Of the difficulty of expounding scripture 421

§ 5. Of the insufficiency and uncertainty of tradition to expound scripture or determine questions 428

§ 6. Of the uncertainty and insufficiency of councils ecclesiastical to the same purpose 442

§ 7. Of the fallibility of the pope and the uncertainty of his expounding scripture and resolving questions 462

§ 8. Of the disability of fathers or writers ecclesiastical to determine our questions with certainty and truth 483

§ 9. Of the incompetency of the church in its diffusive capacity to be judge of controversies, and the impertinency of that pretence of the spirit . 492

§ 10. Of the authority of reason; and that it, proceeding upon best grounds, is the best judge 494

§ 11. Of some causes of error in the exercise of reason which are inculpate in themselves 499

§ 12. Of the innocency of error in opinion in a pious person . . 510

§ 13. Of the deportment to be used towards persons disagreeing, and the reasons why they are not to be punished with death, &c. . . 514

§ 14. Of the practice of christian churches toward persons disagreeing, and when persecution first came in 525

§ 15. How far the church or governors may act to the restraining false or differing opinions 531

§ 16. Whether it be lawful for a prince to give toleration to several religions 533

§ 17. Of compliance with disagreeing persons or weak consciences in general 536

§ 18. A particular consideration of the opinions of the anabaptists . . 540

§ 19. That there may be no toleration of doctrines inconsistent with piety or the public good 589

§ 20. How far the religion of the church of Rome is tolerable . . 591

§ 21. Of the duty of particular churches in allowing communion . . 601

§ 22. That particular men may communicate with churches of different persuasions; and how far they may do it 602

CONTENTS.

A DISCOURSE OF CONFIRMATION.

PAGE

Epistle dedicatory 609
Introduction 615
§ 1. Of the divine original, warranty, and institution of the holy rite of confirmation 618
§ 2. The rite of confirmation is a perpetual and never ceasing ministry . 633
§ 3. The holy rite of imposition of hands for the giving the Holy Spirit, or confirmation, was actually continued and practised by all the succeeding ages of the purest and primitive church 638
§ 4. The bishops were always and the only ministers of confirmation . 644
§ 5. The whole procedure or ritual of confirmation is by prayer and imposition of hands 650
§ 6. Many great graces and blessings are consequent to the worthy reception and due ministry of confirmation 654
§ 7. Of preparation to confirmation and the circumstances of receiving it . 661

[Councils referred to in this volume, with their dates (Harduin);

COUNCIL OF	A.D.
Agde (Agathense)	506
Aix-la-Chapelle (Aquisgranense)	799
Alexandria	340
Ancyra	314
Antioch, against Paul of Samosata	269
——— in Encæniis	341
——— Arianorum	355
Aquileia	381
Arles i.	314
—— ii.	452
Auxerre (Autisiodorense)	578
Basle	1431
Byzac (in Baronius)	504
Carthage ii.	390
——— iii.	397
——— iv.	399
——— De bapt. ii.	254
——— iii.	255
Chalcedon	451
Constance	1418
Constantinople i.	381
——— sub Menna	536
——— in Trullo	687
Fphesus i.	431
——— ii. (Latrocinium)	449
Epone	517
Florence	1438
Francfort	794
Gangra	330
Gentilli	767
Illiberis	313
Illyricum	374
Laodicea	372
Lateran iii.	1179
——— iv.	1215
——— v.	1512
Meaux (Meldense)	845
Milan	355
Milevis ii.	416
Neocæsarea	314
Nice i.	325
—— ii.	787
Orange (Arausicanum)	441
Orleans (Aurelianense) iii.	538
Pisa	1511
Riez (Regiense)	439
Rimini (Ariminense)	359
Rome, sub Sylvestrio	325
——— Alexandro iii.	1179
Sardica[a]	347
Seville (Hispalense) ii.	619
Sinuessa	303
Sirmium	357
Toledo i.	400
——— iii.	589
——— iv.	633
——— viii.	653
——— xii.	681
Tours (Turonense)	461
Trent	1545
Turin (Taurinense)	397
Vannes[a] (Veneticum)	465
Vase ii.	529]

[a] [Taylor calls them by mistake the councils of Sardis and Venice]

The editions of the several works contained in this volume which have been collated for the present publication, are, with the letters used to designate them in the notes, as follows:

Episcopacy asserted . . . 1642, A[a]; 1657, B; 1674, C.

Apology for Set Forms { 1646, A; then, the same enlarged, 1649, B; 1657, C; 1673, D.

Reverence due to the Altar, now first printed.

Liberty of Prophesying, 1647, A; 1657, B; 1674, C.

Discourse of Confirmation, 1664 and 1673; no material difference.

[a] The edition of 1647 was merely a fresh issue of the first impression, with a new title-page.

I.

OF THE SACRED ORDER AND OFFICES OF EPISCOPACY.

II.

AN APOLOGY FOR AUTHORIZED AND SET FORMS OF LITURGY.

III.

ON THE REVERENCE DUE TO THE ALTAR.

IV.

LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING.

V.

DISCOURSE OF CONFIRMATION.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

AND TRULY NOBLE

CHRISTOPHER LORD HATTON[a],

BARON HATTON OF KIRBY,

PRIVY COUNCILLOR AND COMPTROLLER OF THE HOUSEHOLD TO HIS LATE MAJESTY, AND KNIGHT OF THE HONOURABLE ORDER OF THE BATH.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MY LORD,

WHEN we make books and publish them, and by dedications implore the patronage of some worthy person, I find by experience that we cannot acquire that end which is pretended to by such addresses; for neither friendship nor power, interest or favour, can give those defences to a book which it needs: because the evil fortune of books comes from causes discernible indeed, but irremediable; and the breath of the people is like the voice of an exterminating angel, not so killing but so secret. But that's not all; it is also as contingent as the smiles of an infant, or the fall of a die, which is determined by every part of motion which can be in any part of the hand or arm. For when I consider that the infinite variety of understandings is greater than that of faces, not only because the lines that make our faces are finite, but the things that integrate and actuate the understanding are not; but also because every man hath a face, but every man hath not understanding; and men with their understandings, or with their no understandings, give their sentence upon books, not only before they understand all, not only before they read all, but before they read three pages, receiving their information from humour or interest, from chance or mistake, from him that reads in malice, or from him that reads after dinner; I find it necessary that he that writes should secure himself and his own reputation by all the ways of prudence and religion; that God, who takes care of fame as certainly as of lives, may do that which is best in this instance; for no other patron

[a] [This dedication belongs to the volume which appeared in 1657, called Σύμβολον Θεολογικο-πολεμικον, or a Collection of Polemical and Moral Discourses; containing the Golden Grove, Apology for Liturgy, Episcopacy, Real Presence, Liberty of Prophesying, and some minor works, which it was now no longer needful to keep together.—See page 3 below.]

can defend him that writes from him that reads, and understands either too much or too little. And therefore, my lord, I could not choose you to be the patron of my book upon hopes you can by greatness or interest secure it against the stings of insects and imperfect creatures; nothing but Domitian's style can make them harmless; but I can from your wisdom and your learning, the great reputation you have abroad and the honour you have at home, hope that for the relation-sake some will be civil to it, at least until they read it, and then I give them leave to do what they please, for I am secure enough in all this; because my writings are not intended as a stratagem for noises; I intend to do not only what is good, but what is best; and therefore I am not troubled at any event, so I may but justly hope that God is glorified in the ministration: but he that seeks any thing but God's service, shall have such a reward as will do him no good.

But finding nothing reasonable in the expectation that the dedication should defend the book, and that the gate should be a fortification to the house, I have sometimes believed that most men intend it to other purposes than this, and that because they design or hope to themselves (at least at second hand) an artificial immortality, they would also adopt their patron or their friend into a participation of it; doing as the Cæsars did, who, taking a partner to the empire, did not divide the honour or the power, but the ministration. But in this also I find that this address to your lordship must be destitute of any material event, not only because you have secured to yourself a great name in all the registers of honour by your skill and love to all things that are excellent, but because of all men in the world I am the unfittest to speak those great things of your lordship which your worthiness must challenge of all that know you. For though I was wooed to love and honour you by the beauties of your virtue and the sweetness of your disposition, by your worthy employments at court and your being so beloved in your country, by the value your friends put upon you and the regard that strangers paid to you, by your zeal for the church and your busy care in the promoting all worthy learnings, by your religion and your nobleness; yet when I once came into a conversation with these excellencies, I found from your lordship not only the example of so many virtues but the expressions of so many favours and kindnesses to my person, that I became too much interested to look upon you with indifferency, and too much convinced of your worthiness to speak of it temperately; and therefore I resolve to keep where I am, and to love and enjoy what I am so unfit to publish and express.

But my lord, give me leave to account to you concerning the present collection; and I shall no otherwise trouble your lordship than I do almost every day, when my good fortune allows me the comfort and advantages of your conversation. The former impressions of

these books being spent, and the world being willing enough to receive more of them, it was thought fit to draw into one volume[b] all these lesser books which at several times were made public, and which by some collateral improvements they were to receive now from me might do some more advantages to one another, and better struggle with such prejudices with which any of them hath been at any time troubled. For though I have great reason to adore the goodness of God in giving that success to my labours, that I am also obliged to the kindness of men for their friendly acceptance of them; yet when a persecution did arise against the church of England, and that I intended to make a defensative for my brethren and myself by pleading for a liberty to our consciences to persevere in that profession which was warranted by all the laws of God and our superiors, some men were angry and would not be safe that way, because I had made the roof of the sanctuary so wide that more might be sheltered under it than they had a mind should be saved harmless: men would be safe alone or not at all, supposing that their truth and good cause was warranty enough to preserve itself; and they thought true; it was indeed warranty enough against persecution, if men had believed it to be truth; but because we were fallen under the power of our worst enemies (for brethren turned enemies are ever the most implacable), they looked upon us as men in mispersuasion and error; and therefore I was to defend our persons, that whether our cause were right or wrong (for it would be supposed wrong) yet we might be permitted in liberty and impunity. But then the consequent would be this: that if we when we were supposed to be in error were yet to be indemnified, then others also whom we thought as ill of were to rejoice in the same freedom, because this equality is the great instrument of justice; and if we would not do to others as we desired should be done to us, we were no more to pretend religion, because we destroy the law and the prophets. Of this some men were impatient; and they would have all the world spare them, and yet they would spare nobody. But because this is too unreasonable, I need no excuse for my speaking to other purposes. Others complained that it would have evil effects, and all heresies would enter at the gate of toleration; and because I knew that they would crowd and throng in as far as they could, I placed such guards and restraints there as might keep out all unreasonable pretenders; allowing none to enter here that speak against the apostles' creed, or weakened the hands of government, or were enemies to good life.

But the most complained that in my ways to persuade a toleration I helped some men too far, and that I armed the anabaptists with swords instead of shields, with a power to offend us besides the proper defensatives of their own. To this I shall need no reply but this: I was to say what I could to make their persons safe by shew-

[b] [See note to page 1 above.]

ing how probably they were deceived; and they who thought it too much had either too little confidence, or too little knowledge of the goodness of their own cause; and yet if any one made ill use of it, it was more than I allowed or intended to him; but so all kindness may be abused. But if a criminal be allowed counsel, he would be scorned if he should avow his advocate as a real patron of his crime when he only says what he can to alleviate the sentence. But wise men understand the thing, and are satisfied; but because all men are not of equal strength, I did not only, in a discourse on purpose, demonstrate the true doctrine in that question, but I have now in this edition of that book answered all their pretensions, not only fearing lest some be hurt with their offensive arms, but lest others, like Tarpeia the Roman lady[c], be oppressed with shields, and be brought to think well of their cause by my pleading for their persons.

And now my lord, I have done all that I can do or can be desired, only I cannot repent me of speaking truth or doing charity; but when the loins of the presbytery did lie heavy upon us, and were like to crush us into flatness and death[d], I ought not to have been reproached for standing under the ruin, and endeavouring to defend my brethren; and if I had strained his arm whom I was lifting up from drowning, he should have deplored his own necessity and not have reproved my charity, if (I say) I had been too zealous to preserve them whom I ought to love so zealously.

But I have been told that my Discourse of Episcopacy relying so much upon the authority of fathers and councils, whose authority I so much diminish in my Liberty of Prophesying, I seem to pull down with one hand what I build with the other: to these men I am used to answer, that they ought not to wonder to see a man pull down his out-houses to save his father and his children from the flames; and therefore if I had wholly destroyed the topic of ecclesiastical antiquity, which is but an outward guard to episcopacy, to preserve the whole ecclesiastical order, I might have been too zealous, but in no other account culpable: But my lord, I have done nothing of this as they mistake.

For episcopacy relies, not upon the authority of fathers and councils, but upon scripture, upon the institution of Christ or the institution of the apostles, upon an universal tradition and an universal practice, not upon the words and opinions of the doctors: it hath as great a testimony as scripture itself hath; and it is such a government, as although every thing in antiquity does minister to it and illustrate or confirm it; yet since it was before the fathers and councils, and was in full power before they had a being, and they were made up of bishops for the most part, they can give no authority to

[c] [Liv. i. 11.]
[d] [See what the writer had in his mind, 'Holy Dying,' chap. iii. sect. 8. § 3.]

themselves, (as a body does not beget itself,) or give strength to that from whence themselves had warranty, integrity, and constitution. We bring the sayings of the fathers in behalf of episcopacy because the reputation they have justly purchased from posterity prevails with some, and their reason with others, and their practice with very many; and the pretensions of the adversaries are too weak to withstand that strength; but that episcopacy derives from a higher fountain, appears by the justifications of it against them who value not what the fathers say. But now he that says that episcopacy besides all its own proper grounds hath also the witness of antiquity to have descended from Christ and His apostles, and he that says that in questions of religion the sayings of the fathers alone is no demonstration of faith, does not speak things contradictory. He that says that we may dissent from the fathers when we have a reason greater than that authority, does no way oppose him that says you ought not to dissent from what they say when you have no reason great enough to outweigh it. He that says the words of the fathers are not sufficient to determine a nice question, stands not against him who says they are excellent corroboratives in a question already determined and practised accordingly. He that says the sayings of fathers are no demonstration in a question, may say true; and yet he that says it is a degree of probability, may say true too. He that says they are not our masters, speaks consonantly to the words of Christ; but he that denies them to be good instructors does not speak agreeably to reason or to the sense of the church. Sometimes they are excellent arbitrators, but not always good judges: in matters of fact they are excellent witnesses; in matters of right or question they are rare doctors, and because they bring good arguments, are to be valued accordingly; and he that considers these things will find that ecclesiastical antiquity can give very great assistances to episcopal government, and yet be no warranty for tyrannical; and although even the sayings of the fathers is greater warranty for episcopacy, and weighs more than all that can be said against it; yet from thence nothing can be drawn to warrant to any man an empire over consciences; and therefore as the probability of it can be used to one effect, so the fallibility of it is also of use to another; but yet even of this no man is to make any use in general, but when he hath a necessity and a greater reason in the particular; and I therefore have joined these two books in one volume, because they differ not at all in the design, nor in the real purposes to which by their variety they minister.

I will not pretend to any special reason of the inserting any of the other books into this volume; it is the design of my bookseller to bring all that he can into a like volume; excepting only some books of devotion which in a lesser volume are more fit for use. As for the Doctrine[e] and Practice of Repentance, which because I suppose

[e] [So C; 'books of devotion, and the doctrine' B.]

it may so much contribute to the interest of a good life, and is of so great and so necessary consideration to every person that desires to be instructed in the way of godliness, and would assure his salvation by all means; I was willing to publish it first[f] in the lesser volume, that men might not, by the increasing price of a larger, be hindered from doing themselves the greatest good to which I can minister; which I humbly suppose to be done, I am sure I intended to have done, in that book.

And now my lord, I humbly desire that although the presenting this volume to your lordship can neither promote that honour which is and ought to be the greatest, and is by the advantages of your worthiness already made public, nor obtain to itself any security or defence from any injury to which without remedy it must be exposed; yet if you please to expound it as a testimony of that great value I have for you, though this signification is too little for it, yet I shall be at ease awhile till I can converse with your lordship by some thing more proportionable to those greatest regards which you have merited of mankind · but more especially of,

my lord,

your lordship's most affectionate servant,

JER. TAYLOR.

[f] [So C; 'willing to leave it' B.]

OF THE

SACRED ORDER AND OFFICES

OF

EPISCOPACY,

BY DIVINE INSTITUTION,

APOSTOLICAL TRADITION,

AND

CATHOLIC PRACTICE.

TOGETHER WITH THEIR

TITLES OF HONOUR, SECULAR EMPLOYMENT, MANNER OF ELECTION,

DELEGATION OF THEIR POWER, AND OTHER APPENDENT QUESTIONS;

ASSERTED AGAINST THE

AËRIANS, AND ACEPHALI, NEW, AND OLD.

BY JER. TAYLOR, D.D.,

CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY.

PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S COMMAND.

There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.—Rom. xiii. 1.

Δικαία ἡ κρίσις τῶν πατέρων· πάντες τὰ αὐτὰ λέγομεν.—Concil. Chalced.

TO

THE TRULY WORTHY

AND MOST ACCOMPLISHED

SIR CHRISTOPHER HATTON,

KNIGHT OF THE HONOURABLE ORDER OF THE BATH.

SIR,

I AM engaged in the defence of a great truth, and I would willingly find a shroud to cover myself from danger and calumny; and although the cause both is and ought to be defended by kings, yet my person must not go thither to sanctuary unless it be to pay my devotion, and I have now no other left for my defence; I am robbed of that which once did bless me, and indeed still does (but in another manner), and I hope will do more; but those distillations of celestial dews are conveyed in channels not pervious to an eye of sense, and now-a-days we seldom look with other, be the object never so beauteous or alluring. You may then think, sir, I am forced upon you; may that beg my pardon and excuse; but I should do an injury to your nobleness, if I should only make you a refuge for my need, (pardon this truth;) you are also of the fairest choice, not only for your love of learning, (for although that be eminent in you yet it is not your eminence,) but for your duty to holy church, for your loyalty to his sacred majesty. These did prompt me with the greatest confidence to hope for your fair encouragement and assistance in my pleadings for episcopacy, in which cause religion and majesty, the king and the church, are interested as parties of mutual concernment.

1. There was an odd observation made long ago, and registered in the law to make it authentic, *Laici sunt infensi clericis*[a]. Now the clergy pray but fight not; and therefore if not specially protected by the king, *contra ecclesiam malignantium*, they are made obnoxious to all the contumelies and injuries which an envious multitude will

[a] [Sext. Decretal. Bonif. viii. lib. iii. tit. 23. cap. 3. init. col. 528.]

inflict upon them. It was observed enough in king Edgar's time[b], *Quamvis decreta pontificum et verba sacerdotum inconvulsis ligaminibus velut fundamenta montium fixa sunt, tamen plerumque tempestatibus et turbinibus sæcularium rerum religio S. matris Ecclesiæ maculis reproborum dissipatur ac rumpitur. Idcirco . . decrevimus nos,* &c. There was a sad example of it in king John's time: for when he threw the clergy from his protection, it is incredible what injuries, what affronts, what robberies, yea what murders, were committed upon the bishops and priests of holy church; whom neither the sacredness of their persons, nor the laws of God, nor the terrors of conscience, nor fears of hell, nor church censures, nor the laws of hospitality, could protect from scorn, from blows, from slaughter. Now there being so near a tie as the necessity of their own preservation in the midst of so apparent danger, it will tie the bishops' hearts and hands to the king faster than all the ties of lay-allegiance, all the political ties, I mean, all that are not precisely religious, and obligations in the court of conscience.

2. But the interest of the bishops is conjunct with the prosperity of the king, besides the interest of their own security, by the obligation of secular advantages. For they who have their livelihood from the king and are in expectance of their fortune from him, are more likely to pay a tribute of exacter duty than others whose fortunes are not in such immediate dependency on his majesty. Æneas Sylvius once gave a merry reason why clerks advanced the pope above a council, viz., because the pope gave spiritual promotions but the councils gave none. It is but the common expectation of gratitude that a patron paramount shall be more assisted by his beneficiaries in cases of necessity, than by those who receive nothing from him but the common influences of government.

3. But the bishops' duty to the king derives itself from a higher fountain. For it is one of the main excellencies in christianity that it advances the state and well-being of monarchies and bodies politic; now then the fathers of religion, the reverend bishops, whose peculiar office it is to promote the interests of christianity, are by the nature and essential requisites of their office bound to promote the honour and dignity of kings, whom christianity would have so much honoured, as to establish the just subordination of people to their prince upon better principles than ever; no less than their precise duty to God, and the hopes of a blissful immortality.—Here, then, is *utile, honestum,* and *necessarium,* to tie bishops in duty to kings; and a threefold cord is not easily broken.

In pursuance of these obligations episcopacy pays three returns of tribute to monarchy.

1. The first is the duty of their people. For they, being by God

[b] In Charta Eadgar. Regis, A.D. 485, [leg. 971,] apud Hen. Spelman. [p. 485.]

himself set over souls, judges of the most secret recesses of our consciences, and the venerable priests under them, have more power to keep men in their duteous subordination to the prince than there is in any secular power, by how much more forcible the impressions of the conscience are than all the external violence in the world. And this power they have fairly put into act; for there was never any protestant bishop yet in rebellion, unless he turned recreant to his order, and it is the honour of the church of England that all her children and obedient people are full of indignation against rebels, be they of any interest or party whatsoever. For here (and for it we thank God and good princes) episcopacy hath been preserved in fair privileges and honour; and God hath blessed and honoured episcopacy with the conjunction of a loyal people. As if because in the law of nature the kingdom and priesthood were joined in one person, it were natural and consonant to the first justice that kings should defend the rights of the church, and the church advance the honour of kings. And when I consider that the first bishop that was exauctorated[c] was a prince too, prince and bishop of Geneva, methinks it was an ill omen that the cause of the prince and the bishop should be in conjunction ever after.

2. A second return that episcopacy makes to royalty is that which is the duty of all christians, the paying tributes and impositions. And though all the king's liege people do it, yet the issues of their duty and liberality are mightily disproportionate, if we consider their unequal number and revenues. And if clergy-subsidies be estimated according to the smallness of their revenue and paucity of persons, it will not be half so short of the number and weight of crowns from lay-dispensation, as it does far exceed in the proportion of the donative.

3. But the assistance that the kings of England had in their councils and affairs of greatest difficulty from the great ability of bishops and other the ministers of the church, I desire to represent in the words of king Alured[d] to Walfsigeus the bishop, in an epistle where he deplores the misery of his own age by comparing it with the former times when the bishops were learned and exercised in public councils: *Felicia tum tempora fuerunt inter omnes Angliæ populos; reges Deo et scriptæ ejus voluntati obsecundarunt in sua pace, et bellicis expeditionibus, atque regimine domestico domi se semper tutati fuerint, atque etiam foris nobilitatem suam dilataverint.* The reason was, as he insinuates before, *Sapientes exstiterunt in Anglica gente de spirituali gradu*, &c. The bishops were able by

[c] [Viz. Peter de la Baume, A.D. 1535. —Ciacon. vitt. pontiff., tom. iii. p. 664.]

[d] [Spelman, p. 379. 'Te scire volo, quod mihi sæpenumero in mentem venit, quales sapientes abhinc extiterunt in Anglica gente, tam de spirituali gradu quam de temporali, quamque felicia tum tempora fuerunt inter omnes Angliæ populos, quemadmodumque reges .. Deo et ejus voluntati scriptæ obsecundarint, utque in sua pace,' &c.]

their great learning and wisdom to give assistance to the king's affairs. And they have prospered in it; for the most glorious issues of divine benison upon this kingdom were conveyed to us by bishops' hands; I mean the union of the houses of York and Lancaster by the counsels of Bishop Morton[e], and of England and Scotland by the treaty of Bishop Fox[f]; to which if we add two other *in materia religionis*, I mean the conversion of the kingdom from paganism by St. Augustine archbishop of Canterbury, and the Reformation begun and promoted by bishops, I think we cannot call to mind four blessings equal to these in any age or kingdom, in all which God was pleased by the mediation of bishops, as He useth to do, to bless the people. And this may not only be expected in reason, but in good divinity; for amongst the gifts of the Spirit which God hath given to His church, are reckoned doctors, teachers, and helps in governments. To which may be added this advantage, that the services of churchmen are rewardable upon the church's stock: no need to disimprove the royal banks to pay thanks to bishops.

But sir, I grow troublesome. Let this discourse have what ends it can; the use I make of it is but to pretend reason for my boldness, and to entitle you to my book: for I am confident you will own any thing that is but a friend's friend to a cause of loyalty. I have nothing else to plead for your acceptance, but the confidence of your goodness, and that I am a person capable of your pardon, and of a fair interpretation of my address to you, by being,

Sir,

your most affectionate servant,

JER. TAYLOR.

[e] John Speed's Hist., lib. ix. cap. 19. n. 23. [p. 716 sq.]

[f] Ibid., cap. 20. n. 64. [p. 747.]

[g] [1 Cor. xii. 28.]

OF THE

SACRED ORDER AND OFFICES

OF

EPISCOPACY,

BY

DIVINE INSTITUTION, APOSTOLICAL TRADITION, AND CATHOLIC PRACTICE, &c.

In all those accursed machinations which the device and artifice of hell hath invented for the supplanting of the church, *inimicus homo*[a], that old superseminator of heresies and crude mischiefs, hath endeavoured to be curiously compendious, and, with Tarquin's[b] device, *putare summa papaverum.* And therefore in the three ages of martyrs, it was a ruled case in that Burgundian forge, *Qui prior erat dignitate prior trahebatur ad martyrium.* The priests, but to be sure the bishops, must pay for all, *Tolle impios, Polycarpus requiratur*[c]. Away with these peddling persecutions, ἀξίνην πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν, 'lay the axe at the root of the tree.' Insomuch that in Rome, from St. Peter and St. Paul to St. Sylvester, thirty-three bishops of Rome in immediate succession suffered an honourable and glorious martyrdom, unless Meltiades[d] be perhaps excepted, whom Eusebius[e] and Optatus[f] report to have lived till[g] the time of the third consulship of Constantine and Licinius. *Conteret caput ejus,* was the glorious promise, Christ should 'break the devil's head[h];' and though the devil's active part of the duel was far less, yet he would venture at that too, even to strike at the heads of the church, *capita vicaria,* for the Head of all was past his striking now; and this I say he offered to do by martyrdom, but that instead of breaking, crowned them.

His next onset was by Julian, and *occidere presbyterium,* that was his province. To shut up public schools, to force Christians to ignorance, to impoverish and disgrace the clergy, to make them vile and dishonourable, these were his arts; and he did the devil more service in this fineness of undermining, than all the open battery of

[a] [Matt. xiii. 28.]
[b] [Liv. i. 54.]
[c] [Euseb. H. E. iv. 15.]
[d] [al. 'Miltiades' seu 'Melchiades.'] 'Maximini jussu martyrio coronatur,' saith Platina [p. 33]; but that is wholly uncertain.
[e] [Euseb. H. E. x. 5.]
[f] [Lib. i. cap. 23; and see Du Pin's note.]
[g] ['all,' B, C, but wrongly.]
[h] [Gen. iii. 15.]

the ten great rams of persecution. But this would not take. For "that which is without cannot defile a man." So it is in the church too: *cedunt in bonum* all violences *ab extra*.

But therefore besides these he attempted by heresies to rent the church's bowels all in pieces; but the good bishops gathered up the scattered pieces, and re-united them at Nice, at Constantinople, at Ephesus, at Chalcedon, at Carthage, at Rome, and in every famous place of Christendom; and by God's goodness and the bishops' industry catholic religion was conserved in unity and integrity. Well; however it is, antichrist must come at last, and the great apostasy foretold must be, and this not without means proportionable to the production of so great declensions of christianity. "When ye hear of wars, and rumours of wars, be not afraid," said our blessed Saviour[1], "the end is not yet." It is not war that will do this great work of destruction, for then it might have been done long ere now. What then will do it? We shall know when we see it. In the mean time when we shall find a new device, of which indeed the platform was laid in Aërius and the Acephali, brought to a good possibility of completing, a thing that whosoever shall hear his ears shall tingle, 'an abomination of desolation, standing where it ought not,' *in sacris*, in holy persons and places and offices, it is too probable that this is the preparatory for the antichrist and grand apostasy.

For if antichrist shall exalt himself above all that is called God, and in scripture none but KINGS and PRIESTS are such, *dii vocati, dii facti*, I think we have great reason to be suspicious that he that divests BOTH of their power (and they are, if the king be christian, in very near conjunction) does the work of antichrist for him; especially if the men whom it most concerns will but call to mind, that the discipline or government which Christ hath instituted is that kingdom by which He governs all christendom (so themselves have taught us); so that in case it be proved that episcopacy is that government, then they (to use their own expressions) throw Christ out of His kingdom; and then either they leave the church without a head, or else put antichrist in substitution.

We all wish that our fears in this and all things else may be vain, that what we fear may not come upon us; but yet that the abolition of episcopacy is the forerunner and preparatory to the great apostasy, I have these reasons to shew at least the probability. First, because here is a concourse of times; for now, after that these times have been called the last times for sixteen hundred years together, our expectation of the great revelation is very near accomplishing; and what a grand innovation of ecclesiastical government contrary to the faith and practice of christendom may portend now in these times, when we all expect antichrist to be revealed, is worthy of a jealous man's enquiry. Secondly, episcopacy, if we consider the final cause, was instituted as an obstructive to the diffusion of schism and heresy.

[1] [Matt. xxiv. 6.]

So St. Hierome[j], *In toto orbe decretum est ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ut schismatum semina tollerentur.* And therefore if unity and division be destructive of each other, then episcopacy is the best deletery in the world for schism: and so much the rather because they are *in eadem materia:* for schism is a division for things either personal or accidental, which are matters most properly the subject of government, and there to be tried, there to receive their first and last breath, except where they are starved to death by a desuetude; and episcopacy is an unity of person-governing, and ordering persons and things, accidental and substantial: and therefore a direct confronting of schism, not only in the intention of the author of it, but in the nature of the institution. Now then although schisms always will be, and this by divine prediction (which clearly shews the necessity of perpetual episcopacy, and the intention of its perpetuity, either by Christ himself ordaining it who made the prophecy, or by the apostles and apostolic men at least who knew the prophecy), yet to be sure these divisions and dangers shall be greater about and at the time of the great apostasy; for then, were not the hours turned into minutes, an universal ruin should seize all christendom; "no flesh should be saved if those days were not shortened[k]." Is it not next to an evidence of fact that this multiplication of schisms must be *removendo prohibens?* and therefore that must be by invalidating episcopacy, ordained as the remedy and *obex* of schism, either tying their hands behind them, by taking away their coercion; or by putting out their eyes, by denying them cognizance of causes spiritual; or by cutting off their heads, and so destroying their order. How far these will lead us I leave to be considered. This only; *Percute pastores atque oves dispergentur*[l]; and I believe it will be verified at the coming of that wicked one; "I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep having no shepherd[m]."

I am not new in this conception, I learned it of St. Cyprian[n]. *Christi adversarius et ecclesiæ ejus inimicus ad hoc ecclesiæ præpositum sua infestatione persequitur, ut gubernatore sublato atrocius atque violentius circa ecclesiæ naufragia grassetur,* 'the adversary of Christ and enemy of His spouse therefore persecutes the bishop, that having taken him away he may without check pride himself in the ruins of the church.' And a little after, speaking of them that are enemies to bishops, he says that *Antichristi jam propinquantis adventum imitantur*[o], 'their deportment is just after the guise of antichrist, who is shortly to be revealed.'

But be this conjecture vain or not, the thing of itself is of deep consideration; and the catholic practice of christendom for fifteen

[j] In 1. ad Titum. [ver. 5. tom. iv. part. i. col. 413.]
[k] [Matt. xxiv. 22.]
[l] [Zach. xiii. 7, ed. vulg.]
[m] [1 Kings xxii. 17.]
[n] Epist. lv. [al. lix. pp. 130, 139.]
[o] ['ut conentur imitari,' ed.]

hundred years is so insupportable a prejudice against the enemies of episcopacy, that they must bring admirable evidence of scripture, or a clear revelation proved by miracles, or a contrary undoubted tradition apostolical for themselves, or else hope for no belief against the prescribed possession of so many ages.

But before I begin, methinks in this contestation, *ubi potior est conditio possidentis*, it is a considerable question, what will the adversaries stake against it? For if episcopacy cannot make its title good, they lose the benefit of their prescribed possession: if it can, I fear they will scarce gain so much as the obedience of the adverse party by it, which yet already is their due. It is very unequal; but so it is ever when authority is the matter of the question. Authority never gains by it; for although the cause go on its side, yet it loses costs and damages: for it must either by fair condescension to gain the adversaries lose something of itself, or, if it asserts itself to the utmost, it is but where it was; but that seldom or never happens; for the very questioning of any authority, *hoc ipso*, makes a great intrenchment even to the very skirts of its clothing.

But *huc deventum est*. Now we are in, we must go over.

§ 1. Christ did institute a government in His church.

FIRST then, that we may build upon a rock. Christ did institute a government to order and rule His church by His authority, according to His laws, and by the assistance of the blessed Spirit.

1. If this were not true, how shall the church be governed? For I hope the adversaries of episcopacy, that are so punctual to pitch all upon scripture ground, will be sure to produce clear scripture for so main a part of christianity as is the form of the government of Christ's church. And if for our private actions and duties economical they will pretend a text, I suppose it will not be thought possible scripture should make default in assignation of the public government, insomuch as all laws intend the public and the general directly, the private and the particular by consequence only and comprehension within the general.

2. If Christ himself did not take order for a government, then we must derive it from human prudence and emergency of conveniences and concourse of new circumstances, and then the government must often be changed, or else time must stand still and things be ever in the same state and possibility. Both the consequents are extremely full of inconvenience. For if it be left to human prudence, then either the government of the church is not in immediate order to the good and benison of souls, or if it be, that such an institution, in such immediate order to eternity, should be dependent upon human prudence, it were to trust such a rich commodity in a cock-boat that no wise pilot will be supposed to do. But if there be often changes in government ecclesiastical (which was the other consequent,) in the public frame I mean and constitution of it;

either the certain infinity of schisms will arise, or the dangerous issues of public inconsistency and innovation, which in matters of religion is good for nothing but to make men distrust all; and, come the best that can come, there will be so many church-governments as there are human prudences. For so (if I be not misinformed) it is abroad in some towns that have discharged episcopacy[n]. At St. Galles in Switzerland, there the ministers and laymen rule in common, but a layman is president; but the consistories of Zurich and Basil are wholly consistent of laymen, and ministers are joined as assistants only and counsellors; but at Schaffhausen the ministers are not admitted to so much; but in the Huguenot churches of France the ministers do all.

3. In such cases where there is no power of the sword for a compulsory (and confessedly of all sides there can be none in causes and courts ecclesiastical), if there be no opinion of religion, no derivation from a divine authority, there will be sure to be no obedience, and indeed nothing but a certain public, calamitous irregularity. For why should they obey? Not for conscience, for there is no derivation from divine authority; not for fear, for they have not the power of the sword.

4. If there be such a thing as the power of the keys by Christ concredited to His church for the binding and loosing delinquents and penitents respectively on earth, then there is clearly a court erected by Christ in His church; for here is the delegation of judges, *Tu Petrus, vos apostoli;* whatsoever 'ye shall' bind. Here is a compulsory, *ligaveritis;* here are the causes of which they take cognizance, *quodcunque;* viz. *in materia scandali:* for so it is limited Matt. xviii., but it is indefinite Matt. xvi., and universal, John xx., which yet is to be understood, *secundum materiam subjectam,* in causes which are emergent from christianity, *ut sic,* that secular jurisdictions may not be intrenched upon. But of this hereafter. That Christ did in this place erect a jurisdiction and establish a government, besides the evidence of fact, is generally asserted by primitive exposition of the fathers, affirming that to St. Peter the keys were given, that to the church of all ages a power of binding and loosing might be communicated. *Has igitur claves dedit ecclesiæ . . ut quæ solveret in terra soluta essent in cœlo; . . scilicet ut quisquis in ecclesia ejus dimitti sibi peccata crederet, seque ab his correctus averteret, in ejusdem ecclesiæ gremio constitutus, eadem fide atque correctione sanaretur;* so St. Austin[o]. And again[p], *Omnibus igitur sanctis ad Christi corpus inseparabiliter pertinentibus, propter hujus vitæ procellosissimæ gubernaculum, ad liganda et sol-*

[n] Simler. de Rep. Helvet. fol. 148 et 172. [8vo. Tigur. 1608.]

[o] De doctr. christ., lib. i. cap. 18. [tom. iii. col. 10 D.] Tract. cxviii. in Joan. [§ 4. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 800 G.]

[p] Id. tract. cxxiv. in Joan. [§ 7.] et tract. l. [§ 12.—ibid. coll. 824 E, 633 D.] De agon. christ., cap. xxx. [tom. vi. col. 260 C.] De bapt. contr. Donatist., lib. iii. cap. 17. [tom. ix. col. 117 C sqq.]

venda peccata claves regni cœlorum primus apostolorum Petrus accepit; . . quoniam nec ille solus sed universa ecclesia ligat solvitque peccata; 'St. Peter first received the government in the power of binding and loosing: but not he alone, but all the church,' to wit, all succession and ages of the church. *Universa ecclesia*, viz. *in pastoribus solis*, as St. Chrysostom[q]; *in episcopis et presbyteris*, as St. Hierome[r]; the whole church, as it is represented 'in the bishops and presbyters.' The same is affirmed by Tertullian[s], St. Cyprian[t], St. Chrysostom[u], St. Hilary[v], Primasius[w], and generally by the fathers of the elder, and divines of the middle ages.

5. When our blessed Saviour[x] had spoken a parable of the sudden coming of the Son of Man, and commanded them therefore with diligence to stand upon their watch, the disciples asked Him, "Speakest Thou this parable to us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord shall make ruler over His household to give them their portion of meat in due season?" As if He had said, 'I speak to you; for to whom else should I speak and give caution for the looking to the house in the master's absence? You are by office and designation My stewards, to feed My servants, to govern My house.'

6. In scripture, and other writers, 'to feed,' and 'to govern,' is all one, when the office is either political or economical, or ecclesiastical. "So he fed them with a faithful and true heart, and ruled them prudently with all his power[y]." And St. Peter[z] joins ἐπισκοποῦντες and ποιμαίνοντες together, ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες. So does St. Paul[a], προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ πάντι τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους.—Ἐπισκόπους ἐν ποιμνίῳ, 'rulers' or 'overseers in a flock;' 'pastors:' it is ordinary. Ποιμένα λαῶν, Homer[b]; i. e. βασιλέα ὄχλων. Euripides[c] calls the governors and guides of chariots, ποιμένας ὄχων. And our blessed Saviour himself is called the great 'Shepherd of our souls;' and that we may know the *intentum* of that compellation, it is in conjunction also with ἐπίσκοπος· He is therefore our Shepherd, for He is our Bishop, our Ruler, and Overseer. Since then Christ hath left pastors or feeders in His church, it is also as certain He hath left rulers, they being both one in name, in person, and office. But this is of a known truth to all that understand either laws or languages: οἱ δὲ ποιμαίνοντες ἀρχόντων καὶ ἡγεμόνων ἔχοντες δύναμιν, saith Philo[d], 'they that feed have the power of princes and rulers:' the thing is an undoubted truth to

[q] De sacerd., lib. iii. [cap. 5. tom. i. p. 383.]
[r] In Matt. xvi. [ver. 19. tom. iv. part. i. col. 75.]
[s] Lib. de pudicit. [cap. xxi. p. 574 B.]
[t] Epist. xxvii. [al. xxxiii. p. 66.]
[u] Lib. Quod Christus est Deus. [vid. capp. 12—15, tom. i. p. 574 sqq.]
[v] De Trinit., lib. vi. [§ 37 sq. col. 904.]
[w] In Apocal., lib. iii. [cap. 1.]
[x] [Luke xii. 42.]
[y] [Ps. lxxviii. 72.]
[z] 1 Pet. v. [2.]
[a] Acts xx. [28.]
[b] [Il. α'. 263 et al.]
[c] [Suppl. 674.]
[d] In lib. 'De eo quod deterior potiori insidiatur.' [tom. ii. p. 166.]

most men; but because all are not of a mind, something was necessary for confirmation of it.

§ 2. This government was first committed to the apostles by Christ.

This government was by immediate substitution delegated to the apostles by Christ himself, *in traditione clavium, in spiratione Spiritus, in missione in Pentecoste.* When Christ promised them the 'keys,' He promised them 'power' to 'bind and loose;' when He breathed on them the Holy Ghost, He gave them that actually to which by the former promise they were entitled; and in the octaves of the Passion, He gave them the same authority which He had received from His Father, and they were the 'faithful and wise stewards whom the Lord made rulers over His household.' But I shall not labour much upon this[e]. Their founding all the churches from east to west, and so, by being fathers, derived their authority from the nature of the thing; their appointing rulers in every church; their synodal decrees *de suffocato et sanguine,* and letters missive to the churches of Syria and Cilicia; their excommunications of Hymeneus and Alexander, and the incestuous Corinthian; their commanding and requiring obedience of their people in all things, as St. Paul did of his subjects of Corinth, and the Hebrews, by precept apostolical; their threatening the pastoral rod; their calling synods and public assemblies; their ordering rites and ceremonies; composing a symbol as the *tessera* of christianity; their public reprehension of delinquents; and indeed the whole execution of their apostolate, is one continued argument of their superintendency and superiority of jurisdiction.

§ 3. With a power of joining others and appointing successors in the apostolate.

This power so delegated was not to expire with their persons; for when the great Shepherd had reduced His wandering sheep into a fold, He would not leave them without guides to govern them so long as the wolf might possibly prey upon them, and that is, till the last separation of the sheep from the goats. And this Christ intimates in that promise, *Ero vobiscum (apostolis) usque ad consummationem seculi;—Vobiscum,* not 'with your persons,' for they died long ago; but *vobiscum et vestri similibus,* with apostles to the end of the world. And therefore that the apostolate might be successive and perpetual, Christ gave them a power of ordination, that by imposing hands on others they might impart that power which they received from Christ. For in the apostles there was something extraordinary, something ordinary. Whatsoever was extraordinary, as immediate mission, unlimited jurisdiction, and miraculous operations, that was not necessary to the perpetual regiment of the church, for then the church should fail when these privileges extraordinary did cease. It was not there-

[e] Vide Hilarium in hunc locum et pp. communiter. [In Matth. xxiv. 45. scil. S. Hilar. cap. xxvii. § 1.—De Trin. vi. 37 sq. col. 904.]

fore in extraordinary powers and privileges that Christ promised His perpetual assistance; not in speaking of tongues, not in doing miracles, whether *in materia censuræ*, as delivering to Satan; or *in materia misericordiæ*, as healing sick people; or *in re naturali*, as in resisting the venom of vipers and quenching the violence of flames; in these Christ did not promise perpetual assistance, for then it had been done, and still these signs should have followed them that believe: but we see they do not. It follows then that in all the ordinary parts of power and office, Christ did promise to be with them to the end of the world, and therefore there must remain a power of giving faculty and capacity to persons successively, for the execution of that in which Christ promised perpetual assistance. For since this perpetual assistance could not be meant of abiding with their persons who in few years were to forsake the world, it must needs be understood of their function, which either it must be succeeded to, or else it was as temporary as their persons. But in the extraordinary privileges of the apostles they had no successors; therefore of necessity a succession must be constituted in the ordinary office of apostolate. Now what is this ordinary office? Most certainly since the extraordinary, as is evident, was only a help for the founding and beginning, the others are such as are necessary for the perpetuating of a church. Now in clear evidence of sense these offices and powers are preaching, baptizing, consecrating, ordaining, and governing. For these were necessary for the perpetuating of a church, unless men could be christians that were never christened, nourished up to life without the eucharist, become priests without calling of God and ordination, have their sins pardoned without absolution, be members and parts and sons of a church, whereof there is no coadunation, no authority, no governor. These the apostles had without all question; and whatsoever they had they had from Christ, and these were eternally necessary; these then were the offices of the apostolate which Christ promised to assist for ever, and this is that which we now call the order and office of episcopacy.

§ 4. This succession into the ordinary office of apostolate is made by bishops.

For although deacons and priests have part of these offices, and therefore, though in a very limited sense, they may be called *successores apostolorum*, to wit, in the power of baptizing, consecrating the eucharist, and preaching, (an excellent example whereof, though we have none in scripture, yet if I mistake him not we have in Ignatius[f], calling the college of presbyters σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων, 'a combination of apostles;') yet the apostolate and episcopacy which did communicate in all the power and offices which were[g] ordinary and perpetual, are in scripture clearly all one in ordinary ministration, and their names are often used in common to signify exactly the same ordinary function.

[f] [Ad Trall. § 3.]

[g] ['are' B, C.]

For the apostle and the bishop are all one in name and person.

1. The name was borrowed from the prophet David[h], in the prediction of the apostasy of Judas and surrogation of St. Matthias, Καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος, 'his bishopric,' that is, his apostolate, 'let another take.' The same word according to the translation of the LXX is used by the prophet Isaiah, in an evangelical prediction, Καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, 'I will give thy princes in peace, and thy bishops in righteousness.' *Principes futuros ecclesiæ episcopos nominavit,* saith St. Hierome[i], herein admiring God's majesty in the destination of such ministers whom Himself calls princes. And to this issue it is cited by St. Clement, in his famous epistle to the Corinthians[j]. But this is no ways unusual in scripture: for,

2. St. James the brother of our Lord is called an apostle, and yet he was not in the number of the twelve, but he was bishop of Jerusalem.—First, that St. James was called an apostle, appears by the testimony of St. Paul[k]; "But other apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother."—Secondly, that he was none of the twelve appears also because among the twelve apostles there were but two James's, the son of Alpheus, and James the son of Zebedee, the brother of John; but neither of these was the James whom St. Paul calls 'the Lord's brother.' And this St. Paul intimates in making a distinct enumeration of all the appearances which Christ made after the resurrection[l]; first to Cephas, then to the twelve, then to the five hundred brethren, then to James, then to all the apostles. So that here St. James is reckoned distinctly from the twelve, and they from the whole college of the apostles; for there were, it seems, more of that dignity than the twelve. But this will also safely rely upon the concurrent testimony[m] of Hegesippus[n], St. Clement, Eusebius, Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, and St. Hierome.—Thirdly, that St. James was bishop of Jerusalem, and therefore called an apostle, appears by the often commemoration of his presidency and singular eminency in holy scripture. Priority of order is mentioned, Gal. ii., even before St. Peter, who yet was *primus apostolorum, natura unus homo, gratia unus christianus, abundantiore gratia unus, idemque primus apostolus,* as St. Augustine[o]; yet in his own diocese St. James had priority of order before him, verse 9; "And when 1) James, 2) Cephas, and 3) John," &c.; first James before Cephas and St. Peter[p]. St. James also was president of that synod which the apostles convocated at Jerusalem about the question of circumcision, as is to be seen Acts

[h] [Ps. cix. 8.]
[i] In Esai. lx. 17. [tom. iii. col. 453.]
[j] [Cap. xliii. p. 172.]
[k] [Gal. i. 19.]
[l] [1 Cor. xv.]
[m] Vid. Car. Bovium in Const. apost. schol. [scil. in lib. ii. cap. 59. p. 140 b.]—Hieron. de script. eccles. in Jacobo, [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 101,] et in Gal. i. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 236.]—Epiphan. hær. lxxviii. lxxix. [vol. i. pp. 1039, 1060.]
[n] [Comment. lib. v. teste Hieron. ubi supra.]
[o] Tract. cxxiv. in Joan. [§ 5. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 822 C.]
[p] [Qu. 'St. John.']

xv.[q]; to him St. Paul made his address, Acts xxi.[r]; to him the brethren carried him, where he was found sitting in his college of presbyters; there he was always resident, and his seat fixed; and that he lived bishop of Jerusalem for many years together is clearly testified by all the faith of the primitive fathers and historians. But of this hereafter.

3. Epaphroditus is called the apostle of the Philippians[s]. "I have sent unto you Epaphroditus," *συνεργὸν καὶ συστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον*, 'my compeer and your apostle.' *Gradum apostolatus recepit Epaphroditus*, saith Primasius[t]; and what that is, we are told by Theodoret[t]; *dictus Philippensium apostolus a S. Paulo, quid hoc aliud nisi episcopus?* because he also had received the office of being an apostle among them, saith St. Hierome[u] upon the same place. And it is very observable that those apostles to whom our blessed Saviour gave immediate substitution, are called *ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 'apostles of Jesus Christ;' but those other men which were bishops of churches, and called apostles by scripture, are called *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, 'apostles of churches,' or sometimes 'apostles' alone, but never are entitled, 'of Jesus Christ.' "Other of the apostles saw I none, but James the Lord's brother," Gal. i.[x] There St. James the bishop of Jerusalem is called an 'apostle' indefinitely, but St. Paul calls himself often 'the apostle of Jesus Christ,' 'not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ.' So Peter, 'an apostle of Jesus Christ;' but St. James in his epistle to the Jews of the dispersion writes not himself 'the apostle of Jesus Christ,' but *δοῦλος Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 'James the servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Further yet; St. Paul, although as having an immediate calling from Christ to the office of apostolate at large, calls himself the apostle of Jesus Christ; yet when he was sent to preach to the gentiles, by the particular direction indeed of the Holy Ghost, but by human constitution, and imposition of hands[y]; in relation to that part of his office, and his cure of the uncircumcision, he limits his apostolate to his diocese, and calls himself *ἀπόστολον ἐθνῶν*, 'the apostle of the gentiles[z];' as St. Peter, for the same reason and in the same modification, is called *ἀπόστολος περιτομῆς*, that is, 'the apostle of those who were of the circumcision[a].' And thus Epaphroditus is called 'the apostle of the Philippians,' who clearly was their bishop (as I shall shew in the sequel), that is, he had an apostolate limited to the diocese of Philippi. *Paulatim vero tempore procedente, et alii ab his quos Dominus elegerat ordinati sunt apostoli, sicut ille ad Philippenses sermo declarat, dicens, Necessarium*

[q] [Ver. 13 sqq.]
[r] [Ver. 18.]
[s] [Phil. ii. 25.]
[t] In hunc locum uterque [Primas. p. 150 b.—Theodoret., tom. iii. p. 459.] et Theodoret. in 1 Tim. iii. [ver. 1. tom. iii. p. 652.]
[u] [Tom. v. col. 1095.]
[x] [Ver. 19.]
[y] [Acts xiii. 2, 3.]
[z] [Rom. xi. 13.]
[a] [Gal. ii. 8.]

autem existimo Epaphroditum, &c., so St. Hierome[b]; 'In process of time, others besides those whom the Lord had chosen were ordained apostles:' and particularly he instances in Epaphroditus from the authority of this instance, adding also that by the apostles themselves Judas and Silas were called apostles.

4. Thus Titus, and some other with him, who came to Jerusalem with the Corinthian benevolence, are called ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, 'the apostles of the churches[c];' apostles, I say, in the episcopal sense. They were none of the twelve, they were not of immediate divine mission, but of apostolic ordination; they were actually bishops, as I shall shew hereafter. Titus was bishop of Crete, and Epaphroditus of Philippi; and these were the apostles; for Titus came with the Corinthian, Epaphroditus with the Colossian liberality. Now these men were not ἀπόστολοι, called 'messengers,' in respect of these churches sending them with their contributions; First, because they are not called the apostles of these churches, to wit, whose alms they carried, but simply ἐκκλησιῶν, 'of the churches,' viz. of their own of which they were bishops; for if the title of apostle had related to their mission from these churches, it is unimaginable that there should be no term of relation expressed. Secondly, it is very clear that although they did indeed carry the benevolence of the several churches, yet St. Paul, not those churches, sent them; "And we have sent with them our brother[d]," &c. Thirdly, they are called apostles of the churches, not going from Corinth with the money, but before they came thither from whence they were to be despatched in legation to Jerusalem: "If any enquire of.. Titus, or the brethren, they are the apostles of the churches, and the glory of Christ[e]." So they were apostles before they went to Corinth, not for their being employed in the transportation of their charity. So that it is plain that their apostolate being not relative to the churches whose benevolence they carried, and they having churches of their own, as Titus had Crete, Epaphroditus had Philippi, their apostolate was a fixed residence, and superintendency of their several churches.

§ 5. And office. But in holy scripture the identity of the ordinary office of apostleship and episcopacy is clearer yet. For when the Holy Spirit had sent seven letters to the seven Asian bishops[f], the angel of the church of Ephesus is commended for trying them which say they are apostles and are not, and hath found them liars. This angel of the church of Ephesus, as antiquity hath taught us[g], was at that time Timothy, or Gaius; the first a disciple, the other had been an entertainer of the apostles, and either of them

[b] In cap. i. Gal. [ver. 19. tom. iv. part. 1. col. 236.]
[c] [2 Cor. viii. 23.]
[d] [Ver. 22.]
[e] [Ver. 23.]
[f] Apocal. ii. [ver. 2.]
[g] Doroth. Synops. [p. 149.]

knew them well enough: it could not be that any man should dissemble their persons, and counterfeit himself St. Paul or St. Peter. And if they had, yet little trying was needful to discover their folly in such a case; and whether it was Timothy or Gaius, he could deserve but small commendations for the mere believing of his own eyes and memory. Besides, the apostles, except St. John, all were then dead, and he known to live in Patmos; known by the public attestation of the sentence of relegation *ad insulam*. These men therefore dissembling themselves to be apostles, must dissemble an ordinary function, not an extraordinary person. And indeed by the concourse of story, place and time, Diotrephes was the man St. John chiefly pointed at. For he seeing that at Ephesus there had been an episcopal chair placed, and Timothy a long while possessed of it, and perhaps[h] Gaius after him if we may trust Dorotheus[i], and the like in some other churches, and that St. John had not constituted bishops in all other churches of the lesser Asia, but kept the jurisdiction to be ministered by himself, would arrogantly take upon him to be a bishop without apostolical ordination, obtruding himself upon the church of Ephesus; so becoming ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, 'a busy man in another's diocese.' This and such impostors as this the angel of the church of Ephesus did try, and discover, and convict; and in it he was assisted by St. John himself, as is intimated in St. John's third epistle, written to his Gaius, (v. 9,) "I wrote unto the church," to wit of Asia, "but Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them receiveth us not." Clearly this ψευδοαπόστολος would have been a bishop. It was a matter of ambition, a quarrel for superintendency and pre-eminence, that troubled him; and this also appears further in that he exercised jurisdiction and excommunication where he had nothing to do, (v. 10,) "he forbids them that would receive the brethren, and casteth them out of the church." So that here it is clear this false apostolate was his ambitious seeking of episcopal pre-eminence and jurisdiction without lawful ordination. Φιλοπρωτεύων Διοτρεφὴς, that was his design; he loved to be the first in the church, *esse apostolum, esse episcopum*, 'to be an apostle, or a bishop.'

§ 6. Which Christ himself hath made distinct from presbyters.

But this office of the ordinary apostleship or episcopacy, derives its fountain from a rock, Christ's own distinguishing the apostolate from the function of presbyters. For when our blessed Saviour had gathered many disciples who believed Him at His first preaching, *Vocavit discipulos suos et elegit duodecim ex ipsis quos et apostolos nominavit*, saith St. Luke[j], 'He called His disciples and out of them chose twelve, and called them apostles;' that was

[h] Vide Constit. apost. per Clement. [lib. vii. cap. 46. fol. 125 b.] ubi quidam Johannes in Epheso episc. post Timoth. collocatur.

[i] [p. 149.]

[j] [Chap. vi. 13, et x. 1.]

the first election. *Post hæc autem designavit Dominus et alios septuaginta duos*[k], that was His second election; the first were called apostles, the second were not, and yet He 'sent' them by two and two.

We hear but of one commission granted them, which when they had performed and returned joyful at their power over devils, we hear no more of them in the gospel, but that their names were written in heaven. We are likely therefore to hear of them after the Passion, if they can but hold their own: and so we do; for after the Passion the apostles gathered them together and joined them in clerical commission, by virtue of Christ's first ordination of them; for a new ordination we find none in holy scripture recorded before we find them doing clerical offices. Ananias we read baptizing of Saul; Philip the evangelist we find preaching in Samaria, and baptizing his converts; others also we find presbyters at Jerusalem, especially at the first council; for there was Judas surnamed Justus, and Silas, and St. Mark, and John,—a presbyter (not an apostle) as Eusebius reports him[l],—and Simeon Cleophas[m], who tarried there till he was made bishop of Jerusalem; these and divers others are reckoned to be of the number of the seventy-two by Eusebius and Dorotheus[n].

Here are plainly two offices of ecclesiastical ministries, apostles and presbyters; so the scripture calls them: these were distinct, and not temporary, but succeeded to; and if so, then here is clearly a divine institution of two orders, and yet deacons neither of them. Here let us fix awhile.

§ 7. Giving to apostles a power to do some offices perpetually necessary, which to others He gave not.

Then, it is clear in scripture that the apostles did some acts of ministry which were necessary to be done for ever in the church, and therefore to be committed to their successors, which acts the seventy disciples or presbyters could not do. Ἐκκρίτως δὲ αὐτῇ παρὰ τὰς λοιπὰς τάξεις εἰς λειτουργίαν[o] ὁ θεῖος θεσμὸς ἀπονενέμηκε τὰς θειοτέρας ἱερουργίας, saith St. Denis[p], of the highest order of the hierarchy; 'the law of God hath reserved the greater and diviner offices to the highest order.'

As of ordination.

I. The apostles imposed hands in ordinations, which the seventy-two did not.

1.) The case is known, Acts vi. The apostles called the disciples, willing them to choose seven men whom they might constitute in the ministration and oversight of the poor. They did so, and set them before the twelve apostles; so they are specified and numbered, verse 2 *cum* 6, "and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them." They, not the disciples, not the seventy-two who were there

[k] [Sic vers. antiqua et vulg.]

[l] Lib. iii. [cap. 39.]

[m] [Συμεῶνα τὸν τοῦ Κλωπᾶ.—Euseb. H. E. iii. 11.—'Cleophas, qui et Simon,' Doroth., p. 149.]

[n] [i. e. by Eusebius *or* Dorotheus, for the two writers do not quite agree in their enumeration.]

[o] [leg. αὐτουργίαν.]

[p] Eccles. hierarch., cap. v. [p. 122 D.]

actually present, and seven of them were then ordained to this ministry: for they were not now ordained to be διάκονοι μυστηρίων, but τραπέζων, as the council of Constantinople[q] calls them; and that these were of the number of the seventy-two disciples Epiphanius[r] bears witness, "He sent other seventy-two to preach," ἐξ ὧν ἦσαν οἱ ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ τῶν χηρῶν τεταγμένοι, 'of which number were those seven ordained and set over the widows.' And the same is intimated by St. Chrysostom[s], if I understand him right; Ὁποῖον δὲ ἄρα ἀξίωμα εἶχον οὗτοι καὶ ποίαν ἐδέξαντο χειροτονίαν ἀναγκαῖον μαθεῖν· ἆρα τὴν τῶν διακόνων; καὶ μὴν τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐστὶν ἡ οἰκονομία· 'what dignity had these seven here ordained? of deacons? no, for this dispensation is made by priests, not deacons;' and Theophylact[t], more clearly repeating the words of St. Chrysostom, *pro more suo*, adds this, Τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οἶμαι τὸ ὄνομα εἶναι καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα αὐτῶν· ἀλλὰ τέως εἰς τοῦτο, εἰς τὸ διακονεῖν τοῖς πιστοῖς τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν ἐχειροτονήθησαν· 'the name and dignity of these seven was no less, but even the dignity of presbyters, only for the time they were appointed to dispense the goods of the church for the good of the faithful people.' Presbyters they were, say St. Chrysostom and Theophylact; of the number of the seventy-two, saith Epiphanius. But however, it is clear that the seventy-two were present, for the whole multitude of the disciples was as yet there resident; they were not yet sent abroad, they were not scattered with persecution till the martyrdom of St. Stephen, but "the twelve called the whole multitude of the disciples to them" about this affair, verse 2; but yet themselves only did ordain them.

2.) An instance parallel to this is in the imposition of hands upon St. Paul and Barnabas, in the first ordination that was held at Antioch[u]. "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Saul: λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν, while these men were ministering, the Holy Ghost said to them, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul:" they did so; they "fasted, they prayed, they laid their hands on them, and sent them away; so they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost departed into Seleucia." This is the story; now let us make our best on't.—Here then was the ordination and imposition of hands complete, and that was said to be done by the Holy Ghost which was done by the prophets of Antioch, for they sent them away, and yet the next words are, "so they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost." So that here was the thing done, and that by the prophets alone, and that by the command of the Holy Ghost and said to be His act. Well! but what were these prophets? They were prophets in the church of Antioch: not such as Agabus, and

[q] In Trullo, can. xvi. [tom. iii. col. 1668.]
[r] Hær. xx. [§ 4. p. 50.]
[s] Homil. xiv. in Act. vi. [ver. 1, sqq. tom. ix. p. 115 A.]
[t] In hunc locum. [p. 67.]
[u] [Acts xiii.]

the daughters of Philip the evangelist, prophets of prediction extraordinary, but prophets of ordinary office and ministration; προφῆται, διδάσκαλοι, καὶ λειτουργοῦντες, 'prophets, and teachers, and ministers[x].' More than ordinary ministers, for they were doctors or teachers; and that's not all, for they were prophets too. This even at first sight is more than the ordinary office of the presbytery. We shall see this clear enough in St. Paul[y], where the ordinary office of prophets is reckoned before pastors, before evangelists, next to apostles; that is, next to such apostles οὓς αὐτὸς ἔδωκε, as St. Paul there expresses it; next to those apostles to whom Christ hath given immediate mission. And these are therefore apostles too; apostles *secundi ordinis;* none of the twelve, but such as St. James, and Epaphroditus, and Barnabas, and St. Paul himself. To be sure they were such prophets as St. Paul and Barnabas; for they are reckoned in the number by St. Luke; for here it was that St. Paul, although he had immediate vocation by Christ, yet he had particular ordination to his apostolate or ministry of the gentiles. It is evident then what prophets these were; they were at the least more than ordinary presbyters, and therefore they imposed hands and they only. And yet to make the business up complete, St. Mark was amongst them, but he imposed no hands; he was there as the deacon and minister (verse 5), but he meddled not. St. Luke fixes the whole action upon the prophets, such as St. Paul himself was, and so did the Holy Ghost too; but neither did St. Mark, who was an evangelist and one of the seventy-two disciples (as he is reckoned in the primitive catalogues by Eusebius[z] and Dorotheus), nor any of the college of the Antiochian presbyters that were less than prophets, that is, who were not more than mere presbyters.

The sum is this: Imposition of hands is a duty and office necessary for the perpetuating of a church, *ne gens sit unius ætatis,* 'lest it expire in one age.' This power of imposition of hands for ordination was fixed upon the apostles and apostolic men, and not communicated to the seventy-two disciples or presbyters; for the apostles and apostolic men did so *de facto,* and were commanded to do so, and the seventy-two never did so. Therefore this office and ministry of the apostolate is distinct and superior to that of presbyters; and this distinction must be so continued to all ages of the church; for the thing was not temporary, but productive of issue and succession, and therefore as perpetual as the clergy, as the church itself.

§ 8. And confirmation.

II. The apostles did impose hands for confirmation of baptized people; and this was a perpetual act of a power to be succeeded to, and yet not communicated,

[x] Prophetas duplici genere intelligamus, et futura dicentes, et scripturas revelantes.—S. Ambros. in 1 Cor. xii. [tom. ii. append. col. 153 E.]

[y] [Eph. iv. 11.]

[z] [Sed vid. p. 25. not. n. supr.]

nor executed by the seventy-two or any other mere presbyter. That the apostles did confirm baptized people, and others of the inferior clergy could not, is beyond all exception clear in the case of the Samaritan Christians, Acts viii. For when St. Philip had converted and baptized the men of Samaria, the apostles sent Peter and John to lay their hands on them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. St. Philip, he was an evangelist, he was one of the seventy-two disciples, a presbyter, and appointed to the same ministration that St. Stephen was about the poor widows, yet he could not do this[a]; the apostles must, and did. This giving of the Holy Ghost by imposition of the apostles' hands, was not for a miraculous gift, but an ordinary grace. For St. Philip could and did do miracles enough; but this grace he could not give, the grace of consigning or confirmation. The like case is in Acts xix.[b], where some people having been baptized at Ephesus, St. Paul confirmed them, giving them the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands. The apostles did it; not the twelve only, but apostolic men, the other apostles. St. Paul did it; St. Philip could not, nor any of the seventy-two or any other mere presbyters ever did it that we find in holy scripture.

"Yea, but this imposition of hands was for a miraculous issue; for the Ephesine Christians received the Holy Ghost, and spake with tongues, and prophesied; which effect because it is ceased, certainly the thing was temporary and long ago expired."

1.) Not for this reason, to be sure; for extraordinary effects may be temporary when the function which they attest may be eternal, and therefore are no signs of an extraordinary ministry. The apostles' preaching was attended by miracles, and extraordinary conversions of people, *ut in exordio apostolos divinorum signorum comitabatur effectus et sancti Spiritus gratia, ita ut videres una alloquutione integros simul populos ad cultum divinæ religionis adduci, et prædicantium verbis non esse tardiorem audientium fidem*, as Eusebius[c] tells of the success of the preaching of some evangelists; yet I hope preaching must not now cease because no miracles are done, or that to convert one man now would be the greatest miracle. The apostles when they cursed and anathematized a delinquent, he died suddenly, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira whom St. Peter slew with the word of his ministry; and yet now although these extraordinary issues cease, it is not safe venturing upon the curses of the church. When the apostles did excommunicate a sinner, he was presently delivered over to Satan to be buffeted, that is, to be afflicted with corporal punishments; and now although no such exterminating angels beat the bodies of persons excommunicate, yet the power of excommunication I hope still remains in the church, and the power

[a] S. Cyprian. ad Jubaian. [ep. lxxiii. p. 202.]

[b] [ver. 6.]

[c] Lib. iii. cap. 37. [interpr. Ruffin. p. 69.]

of the keys is not also gone. So also in the power of confirmation[d]; which however attended by a visible miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost in gifts of languages and healing, yet like other miracles in respect of the whole integrity of christian faith, these miracles at first did confirm the function and the faith for ever.

2.) Now then that this right of imposing hands for confirming of baptized people was not to expire with the persons of the apostles, appears from these considerations.

First, because Christ made a promise of sending *vicarium suum Spiritum*, 'the Holy Ghost in His stead;' and this by way of appropriation is called "the promise of the Father[e]." This was pertinent to all christendom, *Effundam de spiritu meo super omnem carnem*[f], so it was in the prophecy. "For the promise is to you and to your children, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται Κύριος, and to all them that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord shall call[g]." So it was in the first accomplishing, "to all," and this "for ever;" for, "I will send the Holy Ghost unto you, and He shall abide with you for ever." For it was *in subsidium*, to supply the comforts of His desired presence, and must therefore *ex vi intentionis* be remanent till Christ's coming again. Now then this promise being to be communicated 'to all,' and that 'for ever,' must either come to us (1) by extraordinary and miraculous mission; or (2) by an ordinary ministry. Not the first; for we might as well expect the gift of miracles. If the second (as it is most certain so), then the main question is evicted; viz., that something perpetually necessary was in the power of the apostles which was not in the power of the inferior ministers, nor of any but themselves and their colleagues; to wit, *ministerium S. Spiritus*, or the ordinary office of giving the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands. For this promise was performed to the apostles in Pentecost, to the rest of the faithful after baptism; *quod enim nunc in confirmandis neophytis manus impositio tribuit singulis, hoc tunc Spiritus sancti descensio in credentium populo donavit universis*, said Eusebius Emissenus[h]. Now we find no other way of performing it, nor any ordinary conveyance of the Spirit to all people, but this; and we find that the Holy Ghost actually was given this way. Therefore the effect, to wit, the Holy Ghost, being to continue for ever, and the promise of universal concernment, this way also of its communication, to wit, by apostolical imposition of hands, is also *perpetuum ministerium*, to be succeeded to, and to abide for ever.

Secondly; this ministry of imposition of hands for confirmation of baptized people is so far from being a temporary grace and to determine with the persons of the apostles, that it is a fundamental point

[d] Vide August. in 1 epist. Joan., tract. vi. [§ 10. tom. iii. part. ii. col. 868.]
[e] [Acts i. 4.]
[f] [Joel ii. 28.]
[g] [Acts ii. 39.]
[h] Serm. de Pentecost. [init. p. 571.]

of christianity, an essential ingredient to its composition. St. Paul[i] is my author, "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, faith towards God, the doctrine of baptism, and of laying on of hands," &c. Here is imposition of hands reckoned as part of the foundation and a principle of christianity in St. Paul's catechism. Now imposition of hands is used by name in scripture but for two ministrations, first for ordination, and secondly for this whatsoever it is. Imposition of hands for ordination does indeed give the Holy Ghost, but not as He is that promise which is called 'the promise of the Father;' for the Holy Ghost for ordination was given before the ascension, John xx.[k] But the promise of the Holy Ghost the Comforter,—the Paraclete, I say, not the ordainer or fountain of priestly order,—that was not given till the day of Pentecost; and besides it was promised to all christian people, and the other was given only to the clergy.—Add to this, that St. Paul having laid this in the foundation, makes his progress from this to perfection as he calls it, that is, to higher mysteries; and then his discourse is immediately of the priesthood evangelical, which is originally in Christ, ministerially in the clergy; so that unless we will either confound the terms of his progress, or imagine him to make the ministry of the clergy the foundation of Christ's priesthood, and not rather contrary, it is clear that by imposition of hands St. Paul means, not ordination, and therefore confirmation, there being no other ordinary ministry of imposition of hands but these two specified in holy scripture. For as for benediction, in which Christ used the ceremony, and as for healing, in which Ananias and the apostles used it; the first is clearly no principle or fundamental point of christianity; and the second is confessedly extraordinary; therefore the argument is still firm upon its first principles.

Lastly; the primitive church did *de facto*, and believed themselves to be tied *de jure* to use this right of confirmation and giving of the Holy Ghost after baptism.

St. Clemens Alexandrinus in Eusebius[l], tells a story of a young man whom St. John had converted and committed to a bishop to be brought up in the faith of christendom; *qui*, saith St. Clement, *eum baptismi sacramento illuminavit, postea vero sigillo Domini tanquam perfecta tutaque ejus animi custodia obsignavit;* the bishop first baptized him, then consigned him.

Justin Martyr[m] says, speaking *pro more ecclesiæ*, according to the custom of the church, that when the mysteries of baptism were done, then the faithful are consigned, or confirmed.

[i] [Heb. vi. 1.]

[k] [ver. 22.]

[l] Hist. Eccles. iii. [cap. 23, ex versione Christophorsoni; quam improbat Valesius.—Clem. Alex. in lib. 'Quis dives salvetur,' cap. 42. p. 959.]

[m] Quæst. cxxxvii. ad orthod. [scil. Titulus quæstionis, p. 440.]

St. Cyprian[n] relates to this story of St. Philip and the apostles, and gives this account of the whole affair; *Et idcirco quia legitimum et ecclesiasticum baptisma consecuti fuerant, baptizari eos ultra non oportebat; sed tantummodo quod deerat, id a Petro et Joanne factum est, ut oratione pro eis habita et manu imposita invocaretur et infunderetur super eos spiritus S. Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem spiritum S. consequantur et signaculo Dominico consummentur,* 'St. Peter and St. John, by imposing their hands on the converts of Samaria, praying over them, and giving them the Holy Ghost, made supply to them of what was wanting after baptism: and this is to this day done in the church: for new baptized people are brought to the bishops, and by imposition of their hands, obtain the Holy Ghost.'

But for this who pleases to be further satisfied in the primitive faith of christendom, may see it in the decretal epistles of Cornelius the martyr to Fabianus[o], recorded by Eusebius[p]; in the epistle written to Julius and Julianus, bishops, under the name of St. Clement[q]; in the epistle of Urban P. and martyr[r]; in Tertullian[s], in St. Austin[t], and in St. Cyril of Jerusalem[u], whose whole third Mystagogic catechism is concerning confirmation; this only. The catholics, whose christian prudence it was in all true respects to disadvantage heretics, lest their poison should infect like a pest, laid it in Novatus's dish as a crime, 'He was baptized in his bed, and was not confirmed,' *unde nec spiritum sanctum unquam potuerit promereri,* 'therefore he could never receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:' so Cornelius in the fore-quoted epistle. Whence it is evident that then it was the belief of christendom, that the Holy Ghost was by no ordinary ministry given to faithful people after baptism, but only by apostolical or episcopal consignation and imposition of hands.

What also the faith of christendom was concerning the minister of confirmation, and that bishops only could do it, I shall make evident in the descent of this discourse. Here the scene lies in scripture, where it is clear that St. Philip, one of the seventy-two disciples as antiquity reports him, and an evangelist and a disciple as scripture also expresses him, could not impose hands for application of the promise of the Father and ministerial giving of the Holy Ghost, but the apostles must go to do it; and also there is no example in scrip-

[n] Epist. lxxiii. ad Jubaian. [p. 202.]
[o] [Sic Ruffinus; al. 'Fabius.']
[p] Hist. eccles., lib. vi. [cap. 43.]
[q] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 128.]
[r] [Cap. vii.] In i. tom. Concil. [scil. Binii, p. 88 D.]
[s] Lib. de baptismo, cap. viii. [p. 226 D.]
[t] Contr. litt. Petil., lib. ii. cap. 104. [tom. ix. col. 293 B.] De Trinit., lib. xv. cap. 26. [tom. viii. col. 999.] vid. etiam S. Hieron. contr. Lucif. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 293 sq.]—S. Ambros. de Sacram., lib. ii. cap. 2. [qu. lib. iii. cap. 2. tom. ii. col. 363 E.]—Euseb. pap. et mart. epist. 3. ad episc. Tusc. et Campan. [Labb. concil., tom. i. col. 1392, fol. Par. 1671.]—Isid. Hispal. de eccles. offic., lib. ii. cap. 26. [et 27, tom. vi. p. 468 sqq.]
[u] [P. 315 sqq.]

ture of any that ever did it but an apostle, and yet this is an ordinary ministry which *de jure* ought, and *de facto* always was continued in the church. Therefore there must always be an ordinary office of apostleship in the church to do it, that is, an office above presbyters, for in scripture they could never do it; and this is it which we call episcopacy.

§ 9. And superiority of jurisdiction.

III. The apostles were rulers of the whole church, and each apostle respectively of his several diocese, when he would fix his chair; and had superintendency over the presbyters and the people, and this by Christ's donation. The charter is by the fathers said to be this, *Sicut misit me Pater, sic ego mitto vos*[x], 'as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' *Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi apostolos suos mittentis, et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes,* said Clarus a Muscula[y], the bishop in the council of Carthage, related by St. Cyprian and St. Austin[z]. But however, it is evident in scripture that the apostles had such superintendency over the inferior clergy (presbyters I mean and deacons) and a superiority of jurisdiction, and therefore it is certain that Christ gave it them, for none of the apostles took this honour but he that was called of God, as was Aaron.

1. Our blessed Saviour gave to the apostles *plenitudinem potestatis.* It was *Sicut misit me Pater,* &c., 'as My Father sent, so I send.' 'You, My apostles whom I have chosen.' This was not said to presbyters, for they had no commission at all given to them by Christ, but at their first mission to preach repentance: I say, no commission at all, they were not spoken to, they were not present. Now then consider. Suppose that, as Aërius did deny the divine institution of bishops over presbyters *cum grege,* another as confident as he should deny the divine institution of presbyters, what proof were there in all the holy scripture to shew the divine institution of them as a distinct order from apostles or bishops? Indeed Christ selected seventy-two and gave them commission to preach; but that commission was temporary, and expired before the crucifixion, for aught appears in scripture. If it be said the apostles did ordain presbyters in every city, it is true, but not sufficient, for so they ordained deacons at Jerusalem, and in all established churches, and yet this will not tant'amount to an immediate divine institution for deacons; and how can it then for presbyters? If we say a constant catholic traditive interpretation of scripture does teach us that Christ did institute the presbyterate together with episcopacy, and made

[x] [John xx. 21.]
[y] ['Mascula,' Ben.]
[z] Lib. vii. de Bapt. contra Donat., cap. 43. [tom. ix. col. 197 D.] Vide etiam S. Cyprian. de Unit. eccles. [passim, e.g. p. 108,] et S. Cyril. in Joh. lib. xii. c. 55, [tom. ii. col. 613, fol. Basil. 1546.]

the apostles presbyters as well as bishops; this is true. But then, First, we recede from the plain words of scripture, and rely upon tradition, which in this question of episcopacy will be of dangerous consequence to the enemies of it; for the same tradition, if that be admitted for good probation, is for episcopal pre-eminence over presbyters, as will appear in the sequel. Secondly, though no use be made of this advantage, yet to the allegation it will be quickly answered, that it can never be proved from scripture that Christ made the apostles priests first, and then bishops or apostles, but only that Christ gave them several commissions and parts of the office apostolical, all which being in one person cannot by force of scripture prove two orders. Truth is, if we change the scene of war and say that the presbyterate as a distinct order from the ordinary office of apostleship is not of divine institution, the proof of it would be harder than for the divine institution of episcopacy. Especially if we consider that in all the enumerations of the parts of clerical offices there is no enumeration of presbyters, but of apostles there is[a]; and the other members of the induction are of gifts of christianity, or parts of the apostolate; and either must infer many more orders than the church ever yet admitted of, or none distinct from the apostolate; insomuch as apostles were pastors, and teachers, and evangelists, and rulers, and had the gift of tongues, of healing, and of miracles. This thing is of great consideration, and this use I will make of it; That either Christ made the seventy-two to be presbyters, and in them instituted the distinct order of presbyterate, as the ancient church always did believe, or else He gave no distinct commission for any such distinct order. If the second be admitted, then the presbyterate is not of immediate divine institution, but of apostolical only, as is the order of deacons; and the whole plenitude of power is in the order apostolical alone, and the apostles did constitute presbyters with a greater portion of their own power, as they did deacons with a less. But if the first be said, then the commission to the seventy-two presbyters being only of preaching that we find in scripture, all the rest of their power which now they have is by apostolical ordinance; and then, although the apostles did admit them *in partem solicitudinis*, yet they did not admit them *in plenitudinem potestatis*, for then they must have made them apostles, and then there will be no distinction of order neither by divine nor apostolical institution neither.

I care not which part be chosen, one is certain; but if either of them be true, then since to the apostles only Christ gave a plenitude of power, it follows that either the presbyters have no power of jurisdiction as affixed to a distinct order, and then the apostles are to rule them by virtue of the order and ordinary commission apostolical; or, if they have jurisdiction, they do derive it *a fonte apostolorum*, and

[a] Eph. iv. [11;] 1 Cor. xii. [28.]

then the apostles have superiority of jurisdiction over presbyters, because presbyters only have it by delegation apostolical. And that I say truth (besides that there is no possibility of shewing the contrary in scripture by the producing any other commission given to presbyters than what I have specified) I will hereafter shew it to have been the faith and practice of christendom, not only that presbyters were actually subordinate to bishops (which I contend to be the ordinary office of apostleship) but that presbyters have no jurisdiction essential to their order, but derivative only from apostolical preeminence.

2. Let us now see the matter of fact. They that can inflict censures upon presbyters have certainly superiority of jurisdiction over presbyters, for *æqualis æqualem coercere non potest*, saith the law. Now it is evident in the case of Diotrephes, a presbyter, and a bishop would-be, that for his peremptory rejection of some faithful people from the catholic communion without cause and without authority, St. John the apostle threatened him in his epistle to Gaius, διὰ τοῦτο ἐὰν ἔλθω ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ, &c. 'wherefore when I come I will remember him;' and all that would have been to very little purpose if he had not had coercive[b] jurisdiction to have punished his delinquency.

3. Presbyters many of them did succeed the apostles by a new ordination, as Matthias succeeded Judas; who before his new ordination was one of the seventy-two, as Eusebius[c], Epiphanius[d], and St. Hierome[e] affirm, and in scripture is expressed to be of the number of them that went in and out with Jesus; St. Clement[f] succeeded St. Peter at Rome, St. Simeon Cleophæ succeeded St. James at Jerusalem, St. Philip succeeded St. Paul at Cæsarea, and divers others of the seventy-two reckoned by[g] Dorotheus, Eusebius, and others of the fathers, did govern the several churches after the apostles' death, which before they did not. Now it is clear that he that receives no more power after the apostles than he had under them, can no way be said to succeed them in their charge or churches. It follows then, since (as will more fully appear anon) presbyters did succeed the apostles, that under the apostles they had not such jurisdiction as afterwards they had. But the apostles had the same which the presbyters succeeded to, therefore greater than the presbyters had before they did succeed. When I say presbyters succeeded the apostles, I mean, not as presbyters, but by a new ordination to the dignity of bishops; so they succeeded, and so they prove an evidence of fact for a superiority of jurisdiction in the apostolical clergy.

[b] ['coercitive' A.]
[c] Hist. eccles. i. [12.] et ii. [1.]
[d] Hæres. xx. [§ 4. p. 50 D.]
[e] De scriptt. eccles. in Matthia. [Verba non sunt Hieronymi, sed a Græcis adjecta.—Opp. S. Hieron. fol. Par. 1602, tom. i. p. 348 D.]
[f] Vid. Irenæum, lib. iv. cap. 63. [al. 33. p. 272.—Vid. etiam lib. iii. cap. 3. p. 175 sq.—Tert. de præscript. [cap. xxxii. p. 213 B.]
[g] [Vid. p. 25. not. n. supr.]

Now that this superiority of jurisdiction was not temporary but to be succeeded in, appears from reason, and from ocular demonstration, or of the thing done.

1. If superiority of jurisdiction was necessary in the ages apostolical for the regiment of the church, there is no imaginable reason why it should not be necessary in succession, since upon the emergency of schisms and heresies, which were foretold should multiply in descending ages, government and superiority of jurisdiction, unity of supremacy, and coercion, was more necessary than at first, when extraordinary gifts might supply what now we expect to be performed by an ordinary authority.

2. Whatsoever was the regiment of the church in the apostles' times, that must be perpetual, (not so as to have all[h] that which was personal and temporary, but so as to have no other;) for that and that only is of divine institution which Christ committed to the apostles; and if the church be not now governed as then, we can shew no divine authority for our government; which we must contend to do, and do it too, or be called usurpers. For either the apostles did govern the church as Christ commanded them, or not. If not, then they failed in the founding of the church, and the church is not built[i] upon a rock. If they did, as most certainly they did, then either the same disparity of jurisdiction must be retained, or else we must be governed with an unlawful and unwarranted equality, because not by that which only is of immediate divine institution; and then it must needs be a fine government, where there is no authority, and where no man is superior.

3. We see a disparity in the regiment of churches warranted by Christ himself, and confirmed by the Holy Ghost, in fairest intimation. I mean the seven angel-presidents of the seven Asian churches. If these seven angels were seven bishops, that is, prelates or governors of these seven churches, in which it is evident and confessed of all sides there were many presbyters, then it is certain that a superiority of jurisdiction was intended by Christ himself, and given by Him, insomuch as He is the fountain of all power derived to the church; for Christ writes to these seven churches, and directs His epistles to the seven governors of these churches, calling them angels; which it will hardly be supposed He would have done if the function had not been a ray of the Sun of righteousness; they had not else been angels of light, nor stars held in Christ's own right hand.

This is certain, that the function of these angels, whatsoever it be, is a divine institution; let us then see what is meant by these stars and angels. "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches[k]."

First then it is evident, that although the epistles were sent with

[h] Ut (puta) viduarum collegium et diaconorum, et cœnobium fidelium, &c.

[i] ['is built,' B, C.]

[k] [Rev. i. 20.]

a final intention for the edification and confirmation of the whole churches or people of the diocese, with an *Attendite quid Spiritus dicit ecclesiis;* yet the personal direction was not to the whole church, for the whole church is called the candlestick, and the superscription of the epistles is not to the seven 'candlesticks,' but to the seven 'stars,' which are the angels of the seven churches, viz., the lights shining in the candlesticks. By the angel therefore is not, cannot be meant, the 'whole church.'

Secondly, it is plain, that by the angel is meant the governor of the church; first, because of the title of eminency, 'the angel' κατ' ἐξοχὴν, that is, the messenger, the legate, the apostle of the church. Ἄγγελοι ἐαυτῶν. For these words 'angel' or 'apostle' although they signify mission or legation, yet in scripture they often relate to the persons to whom they are sent; as in the examples before specified, ἄγγελοι ἐαυτῶν, 'their angels;' ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, 'the apostles of the churches;' ἄγγελος τῆς Ἐφεσίνης ἐκκλησίας, 'the angel of the church of Ephesus;' and divers others. Their compellation therefore being a word of office in respect of Him that sends them, and of eminence, in relation to them to whom they are sent, shews that the angel was the ruler of each church respectively. —Secondly, because acts of jurisdiction are concredited to him; as, 'not to suffer false apostles' (so to the angel of the church of Ephesus) which is clearly a power of cognizance and coercion *in causis clericorum;* to be 'watchful,' and 'strengthen the things that remain;' as to the angel of the church in Sardis, γίνου γρηγορῶν, καὶ στήριξον τὰ λοιπά[l]· the first is the office of rulers, for they "watch for your souls[m];" and the second of apostles and apostolic men; Ἰούδας δὲ καὶ Σίλας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐπεστήριξαν[n], 'Judas and Silas confirmed the brethren;' for these men, although they were but of the seventy-two at first, yet by this time were made apostles and "chief men among the brethren." St. Paul also was joined in this work, διήρχετο ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας[o], 'he went up and down confirming the churches.' And, τὰ λοιπὰ διατάξομαι, St. Paul[p]. To confirm the churches, and to make supply of what is deficient in discipline and government, these were offices of power and jurisdiction no less than episcopal or apostolical. And besides, the angel here spoken of had a propriety in the people of the diocese; "thou hast a few names even in Sardis[q];" they were the bishop's people, the angel had a right to them: and good reason that the people should be his, for their faults are attributed to him, as to the angel of Pergamus, and divers others, and therefore they are deposited in his custody. He is to be their ruler and pastor, and this is called his 'ministry;' to the angel of the church of Thyatira, οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν, 'I have known thy ministry.' His office therefore was clerical, it was an angel-minister; and this

[l] [Rev. iii. 2.] [m] [Heb. xiii. 17.] [n] [Acts xv. 32.]
[o] [ver. 41.] [p] [1 Cor. xi. 34.] [q] [Rev. iii. 4.]

his office must make him the guide and superior to the rest, even all the whole church, since he was charged with all.

Thirdly, by the angel is meant a singular person, for the reprehensions and the commendations respectively imply personal delinquency, or suppose personal excellencies. Add to this, that the compellation is singular and of determinate number, so that we may as well multiply churches as persons; for the seven churches had but seven stars, and these seven stars were the angels of the seven churches. And if by seven stars they may mean seventy times seven stars (for so they may if they begin to multiply) then by one star they must mean many stars; and so they may multiply churches too, for there were as many churches as stars, and no more angels than churches; and it is as reasonable to multiply these seven churches into seven thousand, as every star into a constellation, or every angel into a legion.

But besides the exigency of the thing itself, these seven angels are by antiquity called the seven governors or bishops of the seven churches, and their very names are commemorated. Unto these seven churches, St. John, saith Arethas[r], reckoneth ἰσαρίθμους ἐφόρους ἀγγέλους, 'an equal number of angel-governors;' and Œcumenius[s] in his *Scholia* upon this place saith the very same words. *Septem igitur angelos rectores septem ecclesiarum debemus intelligere eo quod angelus nuntius interpretatur,* saith St. Ambrose[t]: and again, *Angelos episcopos dicit, sicut docetur in apocalypsi Johannis,* 'Let the woman have a covering on her head, because of the angels; that is, in reverence and in subjection to the bishop of the church, for bishops are the angels, as is taught in the Revelation of St. John.' *Divina voce sub angeli nomine laudatur præpositus ecclesiæ,* so St. Austin[u], 'by the voice of God the bishop of the church is commended under the title of an angel.' Eusebius names some of these angels, who were then presidents and actually bishops of these churches. St. Polycarp was one to be sure, *apud Smyrnam et episcopus et martyr,* saith Eusebius[x]; he was the angel of the church of Smyrna; and he had good authority for it, for he reports it out of Polycrates, who a little after was himself an angel of the church of Ephesus; and he also quotes[y] St. Irenæus for it; and out of the encyclical epistle[z] of the church of Smyrna itself; and, besides these authorities it is attested by St. Ignatius[a], and Tertullian[b]. St. Timothy

[r] In Apocal. i. [ver. 20. p. 893.]

[s] [A mistake is here; the passage referred to is one and the same with the preceding, Arethas' Commentary on the Revelation being printed with the works of Œcumenius. We have no commentary of the latter, on the Revelation.]

[t] [Seu Berengaud. in Apoc. i. 20, et Pseudo-Ambros. in 1 Cor. xi. 10.—In opp. S. Ambros., tom. ii. append. coll. 504 E, 147 F.]

[u] Epist. cixii. [Ben. xliii. cap. 8. tom. ii. col. 98 C.] et in Apocal. [hom. ii. tom. iii. part. 2. append. col. 162 E.]

[x] [Lib. v. cap. 24.]

[y] [Ibid., lib. iv. cap. 14.]

[z] [Ibid., lib. iv. cap. 15.]

[a] Epist. ad Polycarp. [in superscript., p. 39.]

[b] De præscript. [cap. xxxii. p. 213.]

was another angel, to wit, of the church of Ephesus; to be sure had been, and most likely was still surviving. Antipas is reckoned by name in the Revelation[c], and he had been the angel of Pergamus; but before this book was written, he was turned from an angel to a saint. Melito in all probability was then the angel of the church of Sardis; *Melito quoque Sardensis ecclesiæ antistes et Apollinaris apud Hierapolim ecclesiam regens celeberrimi inter cæteros habebantur*, saith Eusebius[d]. These men were actually living when St. John writ his Revelation; for Melito writ his book *De Paschate* when Sergius Paulus was proconsul of Asia; and writ after the Revelation, for he writ a treatise of it, as saith Eusebius. However, at least some of these were then, and all of these about that time were bishops of these churches; and the angels St. John speaks of were such who had jurisdiction over their whole diocese; therefore these or such as these were the angels to whom the Spirit of God writ hortatory and commendatory letters, such whom Christ held in His right hand, and fixed them in the churches like lights set on a candlestick that they might give shine to the whole house.

The sum of all is this; that Christ did institute apostles, and presbyters, or seventy-two disciples. To the apostles He gave a plenitude of power, for the whole commission was given to them in as great and comprehensive clauses as were imaginable; for by virtue of it they received a power of giving the Holy Ghost in confirmation, and of giving His grace in the collation of holy orders, a power of jurisdiction and authority to govern the church: and this power was not temporary, but successive and perpetual, and was intended as an[e] ordinary office in the church, so that the successors of the apostles had the same right and institution that the apostles themselves had; and though the personal mission was not immediate, as of the apostles it was, yet the commission and institution of the function was all one. But to the seventy-two Christ gave no commission but of preaching, which was a very limited commission; there was all the immediate divine institution of presbyterate as a distinct order that can be fairly pretended. But yet further, these seventy-two the apostles did admit *in partem solicitudinis*, and by new ordination or delegation apostolical did give them power of administering sacraments, of absolving sinners, of governing the church in conjunction and subordination to the apostles: of which they had a capacity by Christ's calling them at first *in sortem ministerii*, but the exercise and the actuating of this capacity they had from the apostles. So that not by divine ordination or immediate commission from Christ, but by derivation from the apostles and therefore in minority and subordination to them, the presbyters did exercise acts of order and jurisdiction in the absence of the apostles or bishops, or in conjunction

[c] Vide Aretha. in 1 Apoc. [leg. ii. 13. p. 897.]

[d] Hist. eccles., lib. iv. [cap. 26.]

[e] ['any,' B, C.]

consiliary and by way of advice, or before the consecration of a bishop to a particular church. And all this I doubt not but was done by the direction of the Holy Ghost, as were all other acts of apostolical ministration, and particularly the institution of the other order, viz., of deacons. This is all that can be proved out of scripture concerning the commission given in the institution of presbyters; and this I shall afterwards confirm by the practice of the catholic church, and so vindicate the practices of the present church from the common prejudices that disturb us; for by this account episcopacy is not only a divine institution, but the only order that derives immediately from Christ.

For the present only I sum up this with that saying of Theodoret[t], speaking of the seventy-two disciples. *Palmæ sunt isti qui nutriuntur ac eruditur ab apostolis; nam quanquam Christus hos etiam elegit, erant tamen duodecim illis inferiores, et postea illorum discipuli et sectatores,* 'the apostles are the twelve fountains, and the seventy-two are the palms that are nourished by the waters of those fountains; for though Christ also ordained the seventy-two, yet they were inferior to the apostles, and afterwards were their followers and disciples.'

I know no objection to hinder a conclusion; only two or three words out of Ignatius[u] are pretended against the main question, viz., to prove that he although a bishop yet had no apostolical authority; οὐχ ὡς ἀπόστολος διατάσσομαι, 'I do not command this as an apostle, (for what am I and what is my father's house, that I should compare myself with them?) but as your fellow-soldier and a monitor.' But this answers itself, if we consider to whom he speaks it: not to his own church of Antioch, for there he might command as an apostle; but to the Philadelphians he might not, they were no part of his diocese, he was not their apostle, and then because he did not equal the apostles in their commission extraordinary, in their personal privileges, and in their universal jurisdiction, therefore he might not command the Philadelphians, being another bishop's charge, but admonish them with the freedom of a christian bishop, to whom the souls of all faithful people were dear and precious. So that still episcopacy and apostolate may be all one in ordinary office; this hinders not, and I know nothing else pretended; and that antiquity is clearly on this side is the next business.

For hitherto the discourse hath been of the immediate DIVINE INSTITUTION of episcopacy, by arguments derived from Scripture; I shall only add two more from Antiquity, and so pass on to TRADITION APOSTOLICAL.

[t] [Leg. Theophylact.] In Lucæ cap. x. [ver. 1. p. 377.]
[u] Epist. ad Philadelph. [§ 4.]

§ 10. So that bishops are successors in the office of apostleship, according to the general tenent of antiquity.

1.) The belief of the primitive church is that bishops are the ordinary successors of the apostles, and presbyters of the seventy-two; and therefore did believe that episcopacy is as truly of divine institution as the apostolate, for the ordinary office both of one and the other is the same thing. For this there is abundant testimony; some I shall select, enough to give fair evidence of a catholic tradition.

St. Irenæus[h] is very frequent and confident in this particular, *Habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos.—Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent apostoli, . . his vel maxime traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas ecclesias committebant; . . quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes;* 'we can name the men the apostles made bishops in their several churches, appointing them their successors, and most certainly those mysterious secrets of christianity which themselves knew, they would deliver to them to whom they committed the churches, and left to be their successors in the same power and authority themselves had.'

Tertullian[i] reckons Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and others, to be churches apostolical, *apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident,* 'apostolical they are from their foundation and by their succession, for the apostles did found them, and apostles or men of apostolic authority still do govern them.'

St. Cyprian[k]: *Hoc enim vel maxime, frater, et laboramus et laborare debemus, ut unitatem a Domino, et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam, quantum possumus obtinere curemus,* 'we must preserve the unity commanded us by Christ, and delivered by His apostles to us their successors.' 'To us, Cyprian and Cornelius,' for they only were then in view, the one bishop of Rome, the other of Carthage. And in his epistle *ad Florentium Pupianum*[l], *Nec hæc jacto sed dolens profero, cum te judicem Dei constituas et Christi, qui dicit ad apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt, Qui audit vos, me audit,* &c. 'Christ said to His apostles, and in them to the governors or bishops of His church who succeeded the apostles as vicars in their absence, He that heareth you, heareth Me.'

Famous is that saying of Clarus a Muscula the bishop, spoken in the council of Carthage and repeated by St. Austin[m], *Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi apostolos suos mittentis et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes. Nos successimus,* 'we succeed the apostles, governing the church by the same power.'

[h] Lib. iii. [cap. 3. p. 175.]
[i] Lib. de præscript., cap. xxxvi. [p. 215.]
[k] Epist. xlii. [al. xlv.] ad Cornelium, [p. 88.]
[l] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 166.]
[m] De bapt. contr. Donat., lib. vii. cap. 43. [tom. ix. col. 197 D.]

He spake it in full council in an assembly of bishops, and himself was a bishop.

The council of Rome under St. Silvester[n], speaking of the honour due to bishops, expresses it thus; *Non oportere quenquam . . Domini discipulis, id est, apostolorum successoribus, detrahere,* 'no man must detract from the disciples of our Lord, that is, from the apostles' successors.'

St. Hierome[o], speaking against the Montanists for undervaluing their bishops, shews the difference of the catholics' honouring, and the heretics' disadvantaging that sacred order. *Apud nos,* saith he, *apostolorum locum episcopi tenent, apud eos episcopus tertius est,* 'bishops with us [catholics] have the place or authority of apostles, but with them [Montanists] bishops are not the first but the third state of men.' And upon that of the psalmist, *Pro patribus nati sunt tibi filii,* St. Hierome and divers others of the fathers make this gloss, *Pro patribus apostolis filii episcopi, ut episcopi apostolis, tanquam filii patribus, succedant,* 'the apostles are fathers, instead of whom bishops do succeed, whom God hath appointed to be made rulers in all lands.' So St. Hierome[p], St. Austin[q], and Euthymius[r], upon the xliv. psalm, alias xlv.[s]

But St. Austin[t], for his own particular, makes good use of his succeeding the apostles, which would do very well now also to be considered; *Si solis apostolis dixit, Qui vos spernit me spernit, spernite nos; si autem sermo ejus pervenit ad nos et vocavit nos et in eorum loco constituit nos, videte ne spernatis nos;* it was good counsel not to despise bishops, for they being in the apostles' places and offices are concerned and protected by that saying, 'He that despiseth you despiseth Me.' I said it was good counsel, especially if besides all these we will take also St. Chrysostom's testimony[u], *Potestas anathematizandi ab apostolis ad successores eorum nimirum episcopos transit,* 'a power of anathematizing delinquents is derived from the apostles to their successors, even to bishops.'

St. Ambrose[x], upon that of St. Paul, Ephes. iv., *Quosdam dedit apostolos; apostoli episcopi sunt;* 'He hath given apostles, that is, he hath given some bishops.' That's downright; and this came not by chance from him, he doubles his assertion; *Caput itaque in ecclesia apostolos posuit, qui legati Christi sunt, sicut dicit idem apostolus, Pro quo legatione fungimur. Isti sunt episcopi, firmante istud Petro apostolo, et dicente inter cætera de Juda, Et episcopatum ejus accipiat alter.* And a third time, *Numquid omnes apostoli? verum est;*

[n] [Concil. Reg., tom. ii. p. 146.]
[o] Ep. liv. [al. lvii.—tom. iv. part. 2. col. 65.]
[p] [tom. ii. append. col. 241.]
[q] [tom. iv. col. 398.]
[r] [Biblioth. max. vett. patr. per De la Bigne, tom. xix. p. 317 B.]
[s] [ver. 16.]
[t] De verbis Dom., serm. xxiv. [Ben. serm. cii. cap. i. tom. v. col. 535 A.]
[u] [Vid. hom. 'De non anathematizandis' &c., § 3. tom. i. col. 693 B.]
[x] In Eph. iv. 11; et in 1 Cor. xii. 28, sq. [tom. ii. append. coll. 241 B, 153 D, 154 A.]

quia in ecclesia unus est episcopus. Bishop and apostle was all one with St. Ambrose, when he spake of their ordinary offices; which puts me in mind of the fragment of Polycrates, of the martyrdom of Timothy, in Photius[y], ὅτι ὁ ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου καὶ χειροτονεῖται τῆς Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ἐνθρονίζεται, 'the apostle Timothy was ordained bishop in the metropolis of Ephesus by St. Paul, and there enthroned.' To this purpose are those compellations and titles of bishoprics usually in antiquity; St. Basil calls a bishopric, προεδρίαν τῶν ἀποστόλων· and προεδρίαν ἀποστολικὴν, so Theodoret[z], 'an apostolical presidency.' The sum is the same which St. Peter himself taught the church, as St. Clement[a] his scholar, or some other primitive man in his name, reports of him, *Episcopos ergo vicem apostolorum gerere Dominum docuisse dicebat, et reliquorum discipulorum vicem tenere presbyteros debere insinuabat,* 'he [Peter] said that our Lord taught that bishops were to succeed in the place of the apostles, and presbyters in the place of the disciples.' Who desires to be further satisfied concerning catholic consent for bishops' succession to apostles in their order and ordinary office, he may see it in Pacianus the renowned bishop of Barcinona[b], in St. Gregory[c], St. John Damascen[d], in St. Sixtus the first his second decretal epistle[e], and most plentifully in St. Celestine writing to the Ephesine council[f], in the epistle of Anacletus *de Patriarchis et Primatibus*[g], &c.; in Isidore[h], and in Venerable Bede[i]; his words are these, *Sicut duodecim apostolos formam episcoporum exhibere simul et præmonstrare nemo est qui dubitet, sic et hos septuaginta duos figuram presbyterorum . . gessisse sciendum est; tametsi primis ecclesiæ temporibus, ut apostolica scriptura testis est, utrique presbyteri, utrique vocabantur episcopi, quorum unum sapientiæ maturitatem, alterum industriam curæ pastoralis significat; sunt ergo jure divino episcopi a presbyteris prælatione distincti*[k]; 'as no man doubts but apostles were the order of bishops, so the seventy-two of presbyters, though at first they had names in common: therefore bishops by divine right are distinct from presbyters, and their prelates or superiors.'

§ 11. And particularly of St. Peter.

To the same issue drive all those testimonies of antiquity that call all bishops *ex æquo* successors of St. Peter. So St. Cyprian[l], *Dominus noster, cujus*

[y] Biblioth. Phot., n. 254, [p. 468, col. 2. ed. Bekker, 4to. Berol. 1824.]

[z] [Hist. eccl. iii. 14. tom. iii. p. 935.]

[a] Epist. i. [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 95.]

[b] Ep. i. ad Sympron. [Bibl. vett. patr. Galland., tom. vii. p. 259.]

[c] In evang. hom. xxvi. [§ 5. tom. i. col. 1555.]

[d] Orat. ii. de Imagin. [vid. cap. 12. tom. i. p. 336.—Vid. etiam p. 329 D.]

[e] [cap. 2 sq.—Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 202.]

[f] [Epist. viii. inter act. concil. Ephes. act. ii. Concil. Reg., tom. v. p. 592.]

[g] Habetur Can. 'In novo,' [Decret.] dist. xxi. [c. 2. col. 101.]

[h] In synod. Hispal. [ii. cann. 5—7.]

[i] Super Lucam, lib. iii. cap. 15. [al. cap. 42.—tom. v. col. 328.]

[k] ['sunt ergo . . . distincti,' not in Bede.]

[l] Epis. xxvii. ad Lapsos. [al. xxxiii. p. 66.]

præcepta metuere et observare debemus, episcopi honorem et ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in evangelio loquitur, et dicit Petro, Ego tibi dico quia tu es Petrus, &c. . . *inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur*, &c. 'when our blessed Saviour was ordering His church and instituting episcopal dignity, He said to Peter, Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build My church; hence comes the order of bishops, and the constitution or being of the church, that the church be founded upon bishops,' &c.

The same also St. Hierome intimates, *Non est facile stare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri*, 'it is not a small thing to stand in the place of Paul, to obtain the degree of Peter[m];' so he, while he dissuades Heliodorus from taking on him the great burden of the episcopal office. *Pasce oves meas*, said Christ to Peter; and, 'Feed the flock of God which is amongst you,' said St. Peter to the bishops of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; *similia enim successoribus suis Petrus scripsit præcepta*, saith Theodoret[n], 'St. Peter gave the same precepts to his successors which Christ gave to him.' And St. Ephrem[o] speaking of St. Basil the bishop of Cæsarea Cappadocia, *Et sicut rursus Petrus Ananiam et Sapphiram fraudantes de pretio agri enecavit; ita et Basilius, locum Petri obtinens ejusque pariter auctoritatem libertatemque participans, sua ipsius promissione fraudantem Valentem redarguit, ejusque filium morte mulctavit;* 'as St. Peter did to Ananias and Sapphira, so Basil did to Valens and his son, for the same delinquency; for he had the place, liberty, and authority of St. Peter.'

Thus Gaudentius of Brixia[p] calls St. Ambrose the successor of St. Peter; and Gildas[q] surnamed the wise saith that 'all evil bishops whatsoever do with unhallowed and unclean feet usurp the seat of St. Peter.' But this thing is of catholic belief, and of this use;—If the order and office of the apostolate be eternal and to be succeeded in, and this office superior to presbyters; and not only of divine institution, but indeed the only order which can clearly shew an immediate divine commission for its power and authority (as I have proved of the function apostolical); then those which do succeed the apostles in the ordinary office of apostolate have the same institution and authority the apostles had; as much as the successors of the presbyters have with the first presbyters, and perhaps more.

For in the apostolical ordinations they did not proceed as the church since hath done. Themselves had the whole priesthood, the whole commission of the ecclesiastical power and all the offices. Now they in their ordaining assistant ministers did not in every ordination

[m] Epist. i. [tom. iv. part. ii. col. 11.]
[n] lib. xii. Thes. cap. 13. [?]
[o] Orat. de laud. Basil. [interpr. Ger. Voss., tom. iii. p. 228 C, fol. Rom. 1589.]
[p] Tract. prima die suæ ordinat. [tract. xvi. p. 968 D.]
[q] [Magn.] biblioth. ss. pp. tom. v. [p. 682 E.] In eccles. ord. increpat.

give a distinct order, as the church hath done since the apostles. For they ordained some to distinct offices, some to particular places, some to one part, some to another part, of clerical employment; as St. Paul, who was an apostle, yet was ordained by imposition of hands to go to the churches of the uncircumcision, so was Barnabas, St. John, and James, and Cephas, to the circumcision: and there was scarce any public design or grand employment but the apostolic men had a new ordination to it, a new imposition of hands; as is evident in the Acts of the apostles. So that the apostolical ordinations of the inferior clergy were only a giving of particular commissions to particular men, to officiate such parts of the apostolical calling as they would please to employ them in. Nay, sometimes their ordinations were only a delivering of jurisdiction, when the persons ordained had the order before; as it is evident in the case of Paul and Barnabas[r]. Of the same consideration is the institution of deacons to spiritual offices; and it is very pertinent to this question. For there is no divine institution for these, rising higher than apostolical ordinance; and so much there is for presbyters, as they are now authorized; for such power the apostles gave to presbyters as they have now, and sometimes more, as to Judas and Silas and divers others; who therefore were more than mere presbyters as the word is now used.

The result is this: The office and order of a presbyter is but part of the office and order of an apostle; so is a deacon, a lesser part; so is an evangelist; so is a prophet; so is a doctor; so is a helper, or a surrogate in government. But these will not be called orders; every one of them will not, I am sure; at least not made distinct orders by Christ. For it was in the apostles' power to give any one or all these powers to any one man, or to distinguish them into so many men as there are offices, or to unite more or fewer of them. All these, I say, clearly make not distinct orders; and why are not all of them of the same consideration? I would be answered from grounds of scripture, for there we fix as yet.

Indeed the apostles did ordain such men, and scattered their power at first, for there was so much employment in any one of them as to require one man for one office. But a while after they united all the lesser parts of power into two sorts of men, whom the church hath since distinguished by the names of presbyters and deacons, and called them two distinct orders. But yet if we speak properly and according to the exigence of divine institution, there is *unum sacerdotium*, 'one priesthood' appointed by Christ; and that was the commission given by Christ to His apostles and to their successors precisely; and those other offices of presbyter and deacon are but members of the great priesthood; and although the power of it is all of divine institution, as the power to baptize, to preach, to consecrate, to absolve, to minister; yet that so much of it should be given to

[r] [Acts xiii.]

one sort of men, so much less to another, that is only of apostolical ordinance. For the apostles might have given to some only a power to absolve, to some only to consecrate, to some only to baptize. We see that to deacons they did so. They had only a power to baptize and preach; whether all evangelists had so much or no, scripture doth not tell us.

But if to some men they had only given a power to use the keys, or made them officers spiritual to 'restore such as are overtaken in a fault[s],' and not to consecrate the eucharist, (for we see these powers are distinct, and not relative and of necessary conjunction, no more than baptizing and consecrating;) whether or no had those men who have only a power of absolving or consecrating respectively, whether (I say) have they the order of a presbyter? If yea, then now every priest hath two orders, besides the order of deacon; for by the power of consecration, he hath the power of a presbyter; and what is he then by his other power? But if such a man ordained with but one of these powers have not the order of a presbyter, then let any man shew me where it is ordained by Christ, or indeed by the apostles, that an order of clerks should be constituted with both these powers, and that these were called presbyters. I only leave this to be considered.

But all the apostolical power we find instituted by Christ; and we also find a necessity that all that power should be succeeded in, and that all that power should be united in one order; for he that hath the highest, viz., a power of ordination, must needs have all the other, else he cannot give them to any else; but a power of ordination I have proved to be necessary and perpetual.

So that we have clear evidence of the divine institution of the perpetual order of apostleship; marry, for the presbyterate, I have not so much either reason or confidence for it, as now it is in the church: but for the apostolate, it is beyond exception. And to this bishops do succeed. For that it is so, I have proved from scripture; and because "no scripture is of private interpretation[t]," I have attested it with the catholic testimony of the primitive fathers, calling episcopacy the apostolate, and bishops successors of St. Peter in particular, and of all the apostles in general, in their ordinary offices, in which they were superior to the seventy-two, the antecessors of the presbyterate.

One objection I must clear. For sometimes presbyters are also called 'apostles,' and 'successors of the apostles;' as in Ignatius, in Irenæus, in St. Hierome. I answer:—

1. They are not called *successores apostolorum* by any dogmatical resolution or interpretation of scripture, as the bishops are in the examples above alleged, but by allusion and participation at the most: for true it is that they succeed the apostles in the offices of baptiz-

[s] [Gal. vi. 1.] [t] [2 Pet. i. 20.]

ing, consecrating, and absolving *in privato foro;* but this is but part of the apostolical power, and no part of their office as apostles were superior to presbyters.

2. It is observable that presbyters are never affirmed to succeed in the power and regiment of the church, but in subordination and derivation from the bishop; and therefore they are never said to succeed *in cathedris apostolorum,* 'in the apostolic sees.'

3. The places which I have specified, and they are all I could ever meet with, are of peculiar answer.—For as for Ignatius in his epistle to the church of Trallis[u], he calls the presbytery or company of priests, 'the college' or 'combination of apostles.' But here St. Ignatius, as he lifts up the presbyters to a comparison with apostles, so he also raises the bishop to the similitude and resemblance with God; *episcopus typum Dei patris omnium gerit, presbyteri vero sunt conjunctus apostolorum cœtus:* so that although presbyters grow high, yet they do not overtake the bishops or apostles, who also in the same proportion grow higher than their first station. This then will do no hurt.—As for St. Irenæus[v], he indeed does say that presbyters succeed the apostles; but what presbyters he means, he tells us; even such presbyters as were also bishops, such as St. Peter and St. John were, who call themselves presbyters. His words are these, *Propterea*[x] *eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis; .. qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt;* and a little after[y], *Tales presbyteros nutrit ecclesia de quibus et propheta ait, Et dabo principes tuos in pace et episcopos tuos in justitia.* So that he gives testimony for us, not against us.—As for St. Hierome[z], the third man, he in the succession to the honour of the apostolate joins presbyters with bishops; and that's right enough; for if the bishop alone does succeed *in plenitudinem potestatis apostolicæ ordinariæ,* as I have proved he does, then also it is as true of the bishop together with his *consessus presbyterorum. Episcopi et presbyteri habeant in exemplum apostolos et apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes habere nitantur et meritum;* those are his words, and enforce not so much as may be safely granted; for *reddendo singula singulis,* bishops succeed apostles, and presbyters apostolic men; and such were many that had not at first any power apostolical: and that's all that can be inferred from this place of St. Hierome. I know nothing else to stay me, or to hinder our assent to those authorities of scripture I have alleged, and the full voice of traditive interpretation.

[u] [§ 3.] Idem fere habet in epist. ad Magnes. [§ 6.] et Smyrnens. [§ 8.—pp. 22, 19, 36.]

[v] lib. iv. cap. 43. [al. 26. § 2. p. 262.]

[x] ['Quapropter,' ed.]

[y] cap. 44. [al. 26. § 5. p. 263.]

[z] Ep. xiii. [al. xlix.—tom. iv. part. 2. col. 565.]

§ 12. And the institution of episcopacy, as well as the apostolate, expressed to be divine, by primitive authority.

2.) The second argument from antiquity is the direct testimony of the fathers for a divine institution.

In this St. Cyprian[a] is most plentiful, *Dominus noster . . episcopi honorem et ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in evangelio, . . dicit Petro, &c. Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque divina lege fundatum sit, &c.* 'Our Lord did institute in the gospel the honour of a bishop; hence comes the ordination of bishops; and the church is built upon them, and every action of the church is to be governed by them; and this is founded upon a divine law.' *Meminisse autem diaconi debent quoniam apostolos, id est, episcopos, et præpositos Dominus elegit*[b], 'our Lord hath chosen apostles, that is, bishops and church governors.' And a little after, *Quod si nos aliquid audere contra Deum possumus qui episcopos facit, possunt et contra nos audere diaconi, a quibus fiunt*[b], 'we must not attempt any thing against God, who hath instituted bishops.' The same father[c] in his epistle to Magnus disputes against Novatianus his being a bishop, *Novatianus in ecclesia non est, nec episcopus computari potest, qui evangelica et apostolica traditione contempta, nemini succedens, a seipso ordinatus*[d] *est.* If there was both an evangelical and an apostolic tradition for the successive ordination of bishops by other bishops, as St. Cyprian affirms there is by saying Novatianus contemned it, then certainly the same evangelical power did institute that calling for the *modus* of whose election it took such particular order.

St. Ignatius[e], long before him, speaking concerning his absent friend Sotion the deacon, *οὗ ἐγὼ ὀναίμην, ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ χάριτι Θεοῦ, ἐν νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·* he wishes for the good man's company, because 'by the grace of God, and according to the law of Jesus Christ, he was obedient to the bishop and his clergy.' And a little after, *πρέπον οὖν ἐστι καὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπακούειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑμῶν, καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτῷ ἀντιλέγειν· . . οὐ γὰρ τουτονὶ τὸν βλεπόμενον πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον παραλογίζεται, τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον παρά τινος παραλογισθῆναι· τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτο οὐ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ πρὸς Θεὸν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν.* It is home enough; 'ye ought to obey your bishop, and to contradict him in nothing;' it is a fearful thing to contradict him, for whosoever does so 'does not mock a visible man, but the invisible, undeceivable God; for this contumely relates not to man but to God.' So St. Ignatius; which could not be true were it a human constitution and

[a] Ep. xxvii. [al. xxxiii. ad Lapsos. p. 66.]
[b] Epist. lxv. ad Rogatian. [al. ep. iii. p. 6.]
[c] Epist. lxix. [al. lxxvi. p. 181.]
[d] [al. 'ortus.']
[e] Epist. [interpol.] ad Magnes. [§ 2 sq. p. 53 sq.]

no divine ordinance. But more full are those words of his in his epistle to the Ephesians[f], Σπουδάσατε ἁγαπητοὶ ὑποταγῆναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις· ὁ γὰρ τούτοις ὑποτασσόμενος ὑπακούει Χριστῷ τῷ προχειρισαμένῳ αὐτούς· 'he that obeys the bishop and clergy obeys Christ who did constitute and ordain them.' This is plain and dogmatical; I would be loth to have two men so famous, so ancient, and so resolute, speak half so much against us.

But it is a general resolve and no private opinion. For St. Austin[g] is confident in the case with a *Nemo ignorat episcopos Salvatorem ecclesiis instituisse; ipse enim priusquam in cœlos ascenderet imponens manum apostolis ordinavit eos episcopos,* 'no man is so ignorant but he knows that our blessed Saviour appointed bishops over churches, for before His ascension into heaven He ordained the apostles to be bishops.' But long before him,

Hegesippus[h], going to Rome, and by the way calling in at Corinth and divers other churches, discoursed with their several bishops, and found them catholic and holy, and then stayed at Rome three successions of bishops, Anicetus, Soter, and Eleutherius. *Sed in omnibus istis ordinationibus, vel in cæteris quas per reliquas urbes videram, ita omnia habebantur sicut lex antiquitus tradidit, et prophetæ indicaverunt, et Dominus statuit,* 'all things in these ordinations or successions were as our Lord had appointed;' all things; therefore both of doctrine and discipline, and therefore the ordinations themselves too. Further yet, and it is worth observing, there was never any bishop of Rome, from St. Peter to St. Silvester, that ever writ decretal epistle now extant and transmitted to us, but either professedly or accidentally he said or intimated that 'the order of bishops did come from God.'

St. Irenæus[i] speaking of bishops successors to the apostles, saith that with their order of bishopric they have received *charisma veritatis certum,* 'a true and certain or indelible character, *secundum placitum Patris,* according to the will of God the Father.'—And this also is the doctrine of St. Ambrose[j], *Ideo quanquam sit melior apostolus aliquando tamen eget prophetis; et quia ab uno Deo patre sunt omnia, singulos episcopos singulis ecclesiis præesse decrevit,* 'God from whom all good things do come did decree that every church should be governed by a bishop.' And again, *Honor igitur, fratres, et sublimitas episcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari; si regum fulgori compares, &c.* And a little after, *Quid jam de plebeia dixerim multitudine, cui non solum præferri a Domino meruit, sed ut eam quoque jure tueatur patrio, præceptis imperatum est evan-*

[f] [Ep. interpol. ad Eph. § 5. p. 45.]

[g] Quæst. vet. et nov. Testam. qu. xcvii. [tom. iii. part. 2. append. col. 89 F.]

[h] Euseb. [Hist. eccles., lib. iv. cap. 22.]

[i] lib. iv. cap. 43. [al. 26. § 2. p. 262.]

[j] In 1 Cor. xii. [ver. 28.] et De dign. sacerd., cap. ii. [tom. ii. append. coll. 153 F, 359 B.]

gelicis, 'the honour and sublimity of the bishop is an incomparable pre-eminence, and is by God set over the people; and it is commanded by the precept of the holy gospel that he should guide them by a father's right.' And in the close of his discourse, *Sic certe a Domino ad B. Petrum dicitur, Petre, amas me? . . repetitum est a Domino tertio, Pasce oves meas; quas oves et quem gregem non solum tunc B. suscepit . . Petrus, sed et . . cum illo . . nos suscepimus omnes,* 'our blessed Lord committed His sheep to St. Peter to be fed, and in him we' who have pastoral or episcopal authority 'have received the same authority and commission.' Thus also divers of the fathers, speaking of the ordination of St. Timothy to be bishop, and of St. Paul's intimation that it was by prophecy, affirm it to be done by order of the Holy Ghost; τί ἐστιν ἀπὸ προφητείας; ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, saith St. Chrysostom[k], 'he was ordained by prophecy, that is, by the Holy Ghost;' ὁ Θεός σε ἐξελέξατο· οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνῃ γέγονας ψήφῳ, 'thou wert not made bishop by human constitution;' πνεύματος προστάξει, so Œcumenius[l]; 'by divine revelation,' saith Theodoret[m]; 'by the command of the Holy Ghost,' so Theophylact[n]; and indeed so St. Paul to the assembly of elders and bishops met at Miletus, *Spiritus S. posuit vos episcopos,* 'the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops[o]:' and to be sure St. Timothy was amongst them, and he was a bishop, and so were divers others there present; therefore the order itself is a ray streaming from the divine beauty, since a single person was made bishop by revelation. I might multiply authorities in this particular, which are very frequent and confident for the divine institution of episcopacy, in Origen[p]; in the council of Carthage recorded by St. Cyprian[q]; in the collection of the Oriental canons by Martinus Bracarensis[r]; in the councils of Aquisgrane[s], and Toledo[t], and many more. The sum is that which was taught by St. Sixtus[u], *Apostolorum dispositione, ordinante Domino, episcopi primitus sunt constituti,* 'the Lord did at first ordain, and the apostles did so order it, and so bishops at first had their original constitution.'

These and all the former who affirm bishops to be successors of the apostles and by consequence to have the same institution, drive all to the same issue, and are sufficient to make faith that it was the doctrine primitive and catholic that episcopacy is a divine institution, which Christ 'planted' in the first founding of christendom, which the Holy Ghost 'watered' in His first descent on Pente-

[k] Hom. iv. græc. v. lat. in 1 Tim. [cap. i. tom. xi. p. 574 D, E.]
[l] In 1 Tim. [iv. 14. p. 755.]
[m] [In 1 Tim. i. 18.—tom. iii. p. 645.]
[n] [In 1 Tim. iv. 14. p. 776.]
[o] [Acts xx. 28.]
[p] In Joan., tom. xxxii. [passim. e.g. § 10. tom. iv. p. 431.]
[q] [Ep. lxx. prop. fin. p. 192.]
[r] Can. vi. [apud Voell. et Justell. Biblioth. jur. canon. vet.—append. p. xiv.]
[s] Can. xxv. [qu. ix.—tom. iv. col. 1065.]
[t] Octavum, can. vii. [tom. iii. col. 963.]
[u] Ep. ii. [cap. 2. Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 202.]

cost, and to which we are confident that 'God will give an increase' by a never-failing succession, unless where God removes the candlestick, or, which is all one, takes away the star, the angel of light, from it, that it may be enveloped in darkness, *usque ad consummationem sæculi et aperturam tenebrarum.*

The conclusion of all I subjoin the words of Venerable Bede[x] before quoted, *Sunt ergo jure divino episcopi a presbyteris prælatione distincti,* 'bishops are distinct from presbyters and superior to them by the law of God.'

The SECOND basis of episcopacy is APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.

We have seen what Christ did, now we shall see what was done by His apostles; and since they knew their Master's mind so well, we can never better confide in any argument to prove divine institution of a derivative authority than the practice apostolical. *Apostoli autem discipuli veritatis existentes, extra omne mendacium sunt; non enim communicat mendacium veritati, sicut non communicant tenebræ luci, sed præsentia alterius excludit alterum,* saith St. Irenæus[y].

§ 13. In pursuance of the divine institution, the apostles did ordain bishops in several churches.

First then, the apostles did presently after the ascension fix an apostle or a bishop in the chair of Jerusalem. For they knew that Jerusalem was shortly to be destroyed; they themselves foretold of miseries and desolations to ensue (*Petrus et Paulus prædicunt cladem Hierosolymitanam,* said Lactantius, lib. iv. Inst.[z]); famines and wars and not a stone left upon another, was the fate of that rebellious city by Christ's own prediction which themselves recorded in scripture. And to say they understood not what they writ, is to make them enthusiasts, and neither good doctors nor wise seers. But it is ἔξω βέλους that the Holy Spirit, which was promised 'to lead them into all truth,' would instruct them in so concerning an issue of public affairs as was so great desolation, and therefore they began betimes to establish that church, and to fix it upon its perpetual base.—Secondly, the church of Jerusalem was to be the precedent and platform for other churches. The word of God went forth into all the world, 'beginning' first 'at Jerusalem[a];' and therefore also it was more necessary a bishop should be there placed betimes, that other churches might see their government from whence they received their doctrine, that they might see from what stars their continual flux of light must stream.—Thirdly, the apostles were actually dispersed by persecution, and this, to be sure, they looked for, and therefore (so implying the necessity of a bishop to govern in their absence or decession any ways) they ordained St. James the first bishop of Jerusalem;

As St. James at Jerusalem.

[x] lib. iii. in Lucam, c. 15. [vid. p. 42, not. k supra.]

[y] lib. iii. cap. 5. [p. 179.]

[z] [Vid. cap. 21. tom. i. p. 333.]

[a] [Vid. Luke xxiv. 47.]

there he fixed his chair, there he lived bishop for thirty years, and finished his course with glorious martyrdom. If this be proved, we are in a fair way for practice apostolical.

First, let us see all that is said of St. James in scripture that may concern this affair. Acts xv, we find St. James in the synod at Jerusalem, not disputing, but giving final determination to that great question about circumcision. "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said," &c. He first drave the question to an issue, and told them what he believed concerning it, with a πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, 'we trust it will go as well with us without circumcision as with our forefathers who used it.' But St. James, when he had summed up what had been said by St. Peter, gave sentence and final determination, διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, 'wherefore I judge or give sentence.' So he. The acts of council which the brethren or presbyters did use were deliberative; "they disputed," ver. 7; St. Peter's act was declarative, but St. James his was decisive; which proves him clearly (if by reasonableness of the thing and the successive practice of christendom in imitation of this first council apostolical we may take our estimate) that St. James was the president of this synod; which, considering that he was none of the twelve (as I proved formerly[b]), is unimaginable were it not for the advantage of the place, it being held in Jerusalem where he was *Hierosolymorum episcopus*, as St. Clement[c] calls him; especially in the presence of St. Peter, who was *primus apostolus*[d], and decked with many personal privileges and prerogatives.

Add to this, that although the whole council did consent to the sending of the decretal epistle, and to send Judas and Silas, yet because they were of the presbytery and college of Jerusalem, St. James his clergy, they are said as by way of appropriation to come from St. James, Gal. ii. ver. 12. Upon which place St. Austin[e] saith thus, *Cum vidisset quosdam venisse a Jacobo, id est, a Judæa, nam ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ Jacobus præfuit.* To this purpose that of Ignatius[f] is very pertinent, calling St. Stephen the deacon of St. James, and, in his epistle to Hero[g], saying that he did minister to St. James and the presbyters of Jerusalem; which if we expound according to the known discipline of the church in Ignatius's time, who was *suppar apostolorum*, only not a contemporary bishop, here is plainly the eminency of an episcopal chair, and Jerusalem the seat of St. James, and the clergy his own, of a college of which he was the *præpositus ordinarius*, he was their 'ordinary.'

The second evidence of scripture is Acts xxi. "And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly, and the day

[b] [p. 21 supr.]
[c] [Apud Euseb.—vid. not. h infra.]
[d] [Matt. x. 2.—Pseudo-Clement. ad B. Jacobum epist. ed. Coteler., tom. i. p. 611.]
[e] [tom. iii. part. 2. col. 949 A.]
[f] Epist. [interpol.] ad Trall. [§ 7. p. 63.]
[g] [§ 3. p. 109.]

following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present." Why unto James? why not rather unto the presbytery or college of elders, if James did not *eminere*, were not the ἡγούμενος, the *præpositus* or 'bishop' of them all?

Now that these conjectures are not vain and impertinent, see it testified by antiquity, to which in matter of fact and church-story he that will not give faith upon current testimonies and uncontradicted by antiquity, is a madman, and may as well disbelieve every thing that he hath not seen himself, and can no way prove that himself was christened; and to be sure, after sixteen hundred years there is no possibility to disprove a matter of fact that was never questioned or doubted of before, and therefore can never obtain the faith of any man to his contradictory, it being impossible to prove it.

Eusebius[h] reports out of St. Clement: Πέτρον γάρ φησι καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι· 'St. Peter and St. John, although they were honoured of our Lord, yet they would not themselves be, but made James surnamed the Just bishop of Jerusalem.' And the reason is that which is given by Hegesippus in Eusebius[i] for his successor Simeon Cleophæ; for when St. James was crowned with martyrdom, and immediately the city destroyed, *traditur apostolos qui supererant in commune consilium habuisse, quem oporteret dignum successione Jacobi judicare.* It was concluded for Simeon because he was the kinsman of our Lord, as St. James also his predecessor. The same concerning St. James is also repeated by Eusebius[k], *Judæi ergo cum Paulus provocasset ad Cæsarem . . in Jacobum fratrem Domini, cui ab apostolis sedes Hierosolymitana delata fuit, omnem suam malevolentiam convertunt.*

In the Apostolical Constitutions[l] under the name of St. Clement, the apostles are brought in speaking thus, *De ordinatis autem a nobis episcopis in vita nostra, significamus vobis quod hi sunt; Hierosolymis ordinatus est Jacobus frater Domini,* 'St. James the brother of our Lord was ordained bishop of Jerusalem by us' apostles. The same is witnessed by Anacletus[m], *Porro et Hierosolymitarum primus archiepiscopus B. Jacobus, qui Justus dicebatur, et secundum carnem Domini nuncupatus est frater, a Petro, Jacobo, et Joanne apostolis est ordinatus.* And the same thing in terms is repeated by Anicetus[n], with a *Scimus enim beatissimum Jacobum, &c.,* just as Anacletus before. St. James was bishop of Jerusalem, and Peter, James, and John, were his ordainers.

But let us see the testimony of one of St. James his successors in the same chair, who certainly was the best witness of his own church-records. St. Cyril of Jerusalem[o] is the man. *Nam de his non mihi*

[h] Hist. eccles., lib. ii. [cap. i.]
[i] Ibid., lib. iii. [cap. 11.]
[k] Ibid., lib. ii. [cap. 23.]
[l] lib. vii. cap. 46. [fol. 125 a.] et lib. viii. cap. ult. [fol. 157 a.]
[m] Epist. ii. [p. 147.]
[n] Epist. decret. unic. [§ 1. p. 237.]
[o] Catech. iv. [§ 28. p. 65.]

solum sed etiam apostolis et Jacobo hujus ecclesiæ olim episcopo curæ fuit, speaking of the question of circumcision, and things sacrificed to idols; and again he calls St. James[p], *primum hujus parœciæ episcopum,* 'the first bishop of this diocese.'

St. Austin[q] also attests this story; *Cathedra tibi quid fecit ecclesiæ . . in qua Petrus sedit et in qua hodie Anastasius sedet; vel ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, in qua Jacobus sedit et in qua hodie Johannes sedet?* I must not omit the testimony of St. Hierome[r], for it will be of great use in the sequel; *Jacobus,* saith he, *post passionem Domini statim ab apostolis Hierosolymorum episcopus ordinatus;* and the same also he repeats out of Hegesippus. There are many more testimonies to this purpose, as of St. Chrysostom[s], Epiphanius[t], St. Ambrose[u], the council of Constantinople *in Trullo*[x]. But Gregorius Turonensis[y] rises a little higher, *Jacobus, frater Domini vocitatus, ab ipso Domini nostro Jesu Christo episcopus dicitur ordinatus,* 'St. James the brother of our Lord is said to have been ordained bishop by our Lord Jesus Christ himself.' If by *ordinatus* he means *designatus,* he agrees with St. Chrysostom[z]; but either of them both will serve the turn for the present. But either in one sense or the other it is true and attested also by Epiphanius[a]; *Et primus hic accepit cathedram episcopatus, cui concredidit Dominus thronum suum in terra primo,* 'St. James had first the episcopal chair, for our Lord first intrusted His earthly throne to him.' And thus we are encircled with a cloud of witnesses; to all which if we add what I before observed, that St. James is in scripture called an apostle and yet he was none of the twelve, and that in the sense of scripture and the catholic church a bishop and an apostle is all one, it follows from the premises (and of them already there is faith enough made) that St. James was by Christ's own designation and ordination apostolical made bishop of the church of Jerusalem, that is, had power apostolical concredited to him which presbyters had not; and this apostolate was limited and fixed as his successors' since have been.

St. Simeon to be his successor.

But that this also was not a temporary business and to expire with the persons of St. James and the first apostles, but a regiment of ordinary and successive duty in the church, it appears by the ordination of St. Simeon the son of Cleophas to be his successor. It is witnessed by Eusebius[b], *Post martyrium Jacobi . . traditur apostolos &c. habuisse in commune consilium quem oporteret dignum successione Jacobi judicare, omnesque uno consilio atque*

[p] Catech. xiv. [§ 21. p. 216.]
[q] Contr. litt. Petil., lib. ii. cap. 51, et Contr. Crescon., lib. ii. cap. 37. [tom. ix. coll. 254 G, 434 B.]
[r] Lib. de scriptt. eccles. in Jacobo. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 101.]
[s] Hom. xxxviii. in 1 Cor. xv. [§ 4. tom. ix. p. 355 D.] et hom. xxxiii. in Act xv. [init. tom. x. p. 253 C.]
[t] Hær. lxvi. [§ 20. p. 636 C.]
[u] In Gal. i. [ver. 19. tom. ii. append. 213 F.]
[x] [Can. xxxii.—tom. iii. col. 1673.]
[y] [De glor. mart., lib. i. cap. 27.]
[z] In Act. hom. iii. [tom. ix. p. 22 sqq.]
[a] Hær. lxxviii. [§ 7. p. 1039 B.]
[b] Hist. eccles., lib. iii. [cap. 11.]

uno consensu Simeonem Cleophæ filium decrevisse, ut episcopatus sedem susciperet. The same also he transcribes[c] out of Hegesippus, *Posteaquam Jacobus martyr effectus est . . electione divina Simeon Cleophæ filius episcopus ordinatur, electus ab omnibus pro eo quod esset consobrinus Domini;* St. Simeon was ordained bishop 'by a divine election;' and Epiphanius[d] in the catalogue of the bishops of Jerusalem reckons first James, and next Simeon, *qui sub Trajano crucifixus est.*

§ 14. St. Timothy at Ephesus.

The next bishop we find ordained by the apostles was Timothy at Ephesus.

That he was ordained by an apostle appears in scripture; for St. Paul imposed hands on him, that's certain, *Excita gratiam quæ in te est per impositionem manuum mearum*[e], 'by the laying on of my hands.'

That he was there a bishop is also apparent from the power and offices concredited to him.

1. He was to be resident at Ephesus[f]; and although for the public necessities of the church and for assistance to St. Paul he might be called sometimes from his charge, yet there he lived and died as the church story writes, there was his ordinary residence, and his avocations were but temporary and occasional. And when it was, his cure was supplied by Tychicus whom St. Paul sent to Ephesus as his vicar, as I shall shew hereafter.

2. St. Paul in his epistles to him gave directions to him for episcopal deportment, as is plain, "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife[g]," &c.

3. St. Paul concredits jurisdiction to St. Timothy. Over the people; παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε· παραγγέλλειν is of as great extent in St. Timothy's commission as διδάσκειν, 'commanding' as 'teaching.' Over presbyters; but yet so as to make difference between them and the neoterics in christianity, "the one as fathers, the other as brethren[h]." Ἐπίπληξις is denied to be used towards either of them; ἐπίπληξις, ἐπιτίμησις, saith Suidas[i], 'a dishonourable upbraiding or objurgation;' nay, it is more; ἐπιπλήττω is *castigo, plagam infero,* saith Budæus[j]; so that that kind of rebuking the bishop is forbidden to use either toward priest or deacon, clergy or laity, old or young; for 'a bishop must be no striker.' But παρακάλει, that's given him in commission both to old and young, presbyters and catechumens, that is, 'require them,' *postula, provoca;* παρακεκλῆσθαι εἰς συμμαχίαν, Synesius, 'to be provoked to a duel, to be challenged.' And παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς εἰς προσευχήν, Chrysostom[j], '*ad precandum vos provoco;* παρακαλεῖς με εἰς δά-

[c] Hist. Eccles., lib. iv. [cap. 22.]
[d] Hær. lxvi. [§ 20. p. 636 D.]
[e] [2 Tim. i. 6.]
[f] [1 Tim. i. 3.]
[g] [1 Tim. iii. 2.]
[h] [1 Tim. v. 1.]
[i] [ad voc.]
[j] ['Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ προσευχήν, ad precandum vos provoco, Chrysostom.' (Item) 'Pro ἐκκαλῶ, evoco, ut παρακαλεῖν εἰς συμμαχίαν, Synes.' Budæus in voc.]

κρυα, Eurip.[k], 'thou makest me or compellest me to shed tears.' *Suaviter omnia*, that's the way St. Paul takes: meekly, but yet so as to do his office, to keep all in their several duties, and that is by a παράγγελλε ταῦτα, 'command these things;' for so he sums up the bishop's duty towards presbyters, neophytes, and widows, "Give all these things in charge[l]," command all to do their duty; command, but not objurgate. *Et quid negotii esset episcopo ut presbyterum non objurgaret, si super presbyterum non haberet potestatem?* so Epiphanius[m] urges this argument to advantage. For indeed it had been to little purpose for St. Paul to have given order to Timothy how he should exercise his jurisdiction over presbyters and people, if he had had no jurisdiction and coercitive[n] authority at all. Nay, and howsoever St. Paul forbids Timothy to use ἐπίπληξις, which is ἐπιτίμησις, yet St. Paul in his second epistle[o] bids him use it, intimating, upon great occasion; ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον. To be sure παράκλησις, if it be but an urging, or an exhortation, is not all, for St. Paul gives him coercitive jurisdiction as well as directive. Over widows; νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ, 'reject the younger widows,' *viz., a collegio viduarum, ab eleemosynis ecclesiæ.* Over presbyters; for he commands him to have sufficient probate in the accusation of presbyters, of which if he was not to take cognizance, it was to no purpose to number witnesses; κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου, 'receive not a public accusation, *foro externo*, against a priest, *non vocabis in jus, nisi in testimonio duorum*, &c., to wit, in causes criminal; that is sufficient intimation of the bishop's power to take cognizance in causes criminal. Then for his punishing in such causes, it follows in the next words, τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε[p], 'reprehend them publicly,' that is, 'disgrace them;' for ἐλεγχὴς is ἐπονείδιστος, 'indecorous.'

Ἀργεῖοι, ἰδμωροι, ἐλεγχέες, οὔ νυ σέβεσθε[q].

So that ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε in St. Paul is, 'to call them to public account:' that's one part of the jurisdiction; ἔλεγχον τούτου λαβεῖν is, 'to examine.' Plato, *Epist.*[r], διδόναι ἔλεγχον τοῦ βίου, 'to give an account of one's life.' *Idem in Apolog.*[s] And then also it implies punishment upon conviction,

Ἀτρείδη, νῦν δή σε, ἄναξ, ἐθέλουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ
Πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον θέμεναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσι[t].

But the words in St. Paul will clear the business, "Let them that sin be publicly shamed," ἵνα καὶ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσι, "that the rest may fear;" a punishment most certainly, something that is ἐν φύσει τῶν φοβερῶν, *malum in genere pœnæ;* what else should

[k] [Vid. Iphig. in Aul. 497.]
[l] [1 Tim. v. 7.]
[m] Hær. lxxv. [§ 5. p. 909 D.]
[n] ['coercive,' B, C.]
[o] [2 Tim. iv. 2.]
[p] [1 Tim. v. 20.]
[q] Hom. [Il. δ'. 242.]
[r] [Epist. γ'. tom. ix. p. 87.]
[s] [§ 30. tom. ii. p. 356.]
[t] Hom. [Il. β'. 284.]

they fear? to sin? Most true, but why upon this reprehension if not for fear of being punished?

Add to all this,—That here is in this chapter the plain giving of a jurisdiction, an erection of a judicatory, and is all the way direction for his proceeding in cases criminal, appears most evidently, verse 21, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things," χωρὶς προκρίματος, 'without prejudging' the cause of any man before it comes in open contestation under public test of witnesses, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν, 'doing nothing for favour or partiality.' Nothing in the world is plainer for the erection of a consistory than these mandates of St. Paul.

4. Lastly, to make up his episcopal function complete, St. Paul gives him also direction concerning giving of orders, "Lay hands suddenly on no man[u]." *Sub testatione ergo ea quæ ad ordinationem ecclesiæ mandat custodiri; . . ne facile aliquis accipiat ecclesiasticam dignitatem; . . peccat enim si non probat et sic ordinat; melior enim cæteris debet probari qui ordinandus est.—Hæc episcopus custodiens castum se exhibebit religioni, cujus rei in futuro præmium consequetur;* so St. Ambrose[x] upon the place, who is so far from exempting presbyters from being submitted to the bishop's consistory that he does appropriate all his former cautions concerning the judicature and coercitive jurisdiction to causes of the clergy.

Add to this evidence of scripture the testimony of catholic and unquestioned antiquity, affirming St. Timothy to have been ordained bishop of Ephesus by St. Paul. Eusebius[y], speaking of the successions to St. Paul, *Sed et Lucas*, saith he, *in Actibus apostolorum plurimos ejus socios memorat, . . sicut Timothei . . et Titi, quorum alter in Epheso episcopus . . ab eo ordinatus*[z] *præficitur.* St. Ambrose[a] affirms that St. Paul, having ordained him bishop, writes his first epistle to him to instruct him in his episcopal office, *hunc igitur jam creatum episcopum instruit per epistolam quomodo deberet ecclesiam ordinare.* And that this epistle was written to instruct St. Timothy for his own person, and all bishops in him, for their deportment in the office of a bishop, is the united concurrent testimony of St. Vincentius[b], Tertullian[c], St. Chrysostom[d], St. Ambrose[e], Œcumenius[f], Epiphanius[g], Primasius[h], and St. Gregory[i]. As for Epiphanius, in the place now quoted he uses it as an argument against the madness and stupidity of Aërius, contending a bishop

[u] [1 Tim. v. 22.]
[x] [tom. ii. append. col. 301 B.]
[y] Hist. eccl., lib. iii. cap. 4. [Ruffin. interpr., p. 47.]
[z] [deest 'ordinatus.']
[a] Præfat. in 1 Tim. [tom. ii. append. col. 289.]
[b] Contr. hær. [cap. xxii. p. 111.]
[c] Contr. Marcion., lib. v. [cap. 21. p. 486 D.]
[d] Hom. x. in 1 Tim. [cap. iii. 1 sqq. tom. xi. p. 598 E.]
[e] In 1 Tim. vi. [tom. ii. append. col. 303 D.]
[f] In 1 Tim. iv. c. et v. c. [p. 752 sqq.]
[g] Hær. lxxv. [§ 5. p. 908 sq.]
[h] Ad 1 Tim. cap. iv. [vid. p. 173.]
[i] In Pastor., part. ii. cap. 11. [col. 33.]

and a presbyter to be all one, *Docet divinus apostoli sermo quis sit episcopus et quis presbyter, quum dicit ad Timotheum, qui erat episcopus, Presbyterum ne objurges, &c.* I shall transcribe no more testimonies for this particular, but that of the general council of Chalcedon[k], in the case of Bassianus and Stephanus; Leontius the bishop of Magnesia spake it in full council, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Τιμοθέου μέχρι νῦν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ ἐπίσκοποι ἐγένοντο, πάντες ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐχειροτονήθησαν, 'from St. Timothy until now there have been twenty-seven bishops ordained in Ephesus.' Who desires a multitude of testimonies (though enough already have deposed in the cause, besides the evidence of scripture,) may to these add that saying of St. Chrysostom[l], that to Timothy was committed ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τοῦτο Ἀσίας· of Theodoret[m], calling him *episcopum Asianorum;* the subscription to the first epistle to Timothy, which if it were not writ by St. Paul, yet at least will prove a primitive record and very ancient; the fragment of the martyrdom of St. Timothy in Photius[n]; St. Hierome[o]; Theophylact[p]; Isidore[q]; and Nicephorus[r].

And now all is well, if after all this Timothy do not prove an 'evangelist;' for this one objection will be sufficient to catch at to support a drowning cause, and though neither pertinent nor true, yet shall be laid in the balance against all the evidence of scripture and catholic antiquity. But "do the work of an evangelist," saith St. Paul[s]; therefore it is clear St. Timothy was no bishop. No, was not? that's hard; but let us try however.

1. Τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, those are the next words, 'fulfil thy deaconship,' and therefore he was no bishop? As well this as the other; for if deaconship do not exclude episcopacy, why shall his being an evangelist exclude it? Or why may not his being a deacon exclude his being an evangelist, as well as his being an evangelist exclude his being a bishop? Whether is higher, a bishopric or the office of an evangelist? If a bishop's office be higher, and therefore cannot consist with an evangelist, then a bishop cannot be a priest, and a priest cannot be a deacon, and an evangelist can be neither; for that also is thought to be higher than them both. But if the office of an evangelist be higher, then as long as they are not disparate, much less destructive of each other, they may have leave to consist in subordination. For as for the pretence that an evangelist is an office of a moveable employment, and a bishopric of fixed residence, that will be considered by and by.

2. All the former discourse is upon supposition that the word

[k] Act. xi. [tom. ii. col. 557 D.]
[l] In Titum et 1 Philip.
[m] [In 1 Tim. iii. 1.—tom. iii. p. 652.]
[n] Biblioth. Photii, n. 254. [p. 468.]
[o] De script. eccles. [vid. p. 34. not. e. supr.]
[p] In præf. 1 Tim. [p. 740.]
[q] De vita et mort. ss. [lvii sq. tom. vii. p. 396.]
[r] Lib. ii. cap. 34. [tom. i. p. 189.]
[s] [2 Tim. iv. 5.]

διακονία implies the 'office of a deacon;' and so it may, as well as St. Paul's other phrase implies St. Timothy to be an evangelist, for if we mark it well, it is ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, 'do the work,' not the 'office,' 'of an evangelist.' And what's that? we may see it in the verses immediately going before, κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ. And if this be the work of an evangelist which St. Paul would have Timothy perform, viz., 'to preach, to be instant in season and out of season, to reprove, to rebuke, to exhort,' there is no harm done; a bishop may, nay, he must do all this.

3. Consider we what an 'evangelist' is, and thence take our estimate for the present. First, he that writes the story of the gospel is an evangelist; so the Greek scholiast calls him. And in this sense indeed St. Timothy was not an evangelist; but yet if he had, he might have been a bishop; because St. Mark was an evangelist to be sure, and perhaps as sure that he was a bishop; sure enough; for they are both delivered to us by the catholic testimony of the primitive church, as we shall see hereafter, so far as concerns our question. But then again, an apostle might be an evangelist; St. Matthew was; and St. John was; and the apostolical dignity is as much inconsistent with the office of an evangelist as episcopal pre-eminence; for I have proved these two names, apostle and bishop, to signify all one thing.—Secondly, St. Ambrose[t] gives another exposition of evangelists, *Evangelistæ diaconi sunt, sicut fuit Philippus.* St. Philip was one of the seven commonly called deacons, and he was also a presbyter, and yet an evangelist; and yet a presbyter in its proportion is an office of as necessary residence as a bishop, or else why are presbyters cried out against so bitterly in all cases for non-residence? And yet nothing hinders but that St. Timothy as well as St. Philip might have been a presbyter and an evangelist together; and then why not a bishop too, for why should a deaconship or a presbyterate consist with the office of an evangelist more than a bishopric?—Thirdly, another acceptation of 'evangelist' is also in Eusebius[u], *Sed et alii plurimi per idem tempus apostolorum discipuli superstites erant; . . nonnulli ex his ardentiores divinæ philosophiæ*[x], *animas suas verbo Dei consecrabant, . . ut si quibus forte provinciis nomen fidei esset incognitum, prædicarent, primaque apud eos fundamenta evangelii collocantes . . evangelistarum fungebantur officio.* They that planted the gospel first in any country, they were evangelists. St. Timothy might be such a one, and yet be a bishop afterwards. And so were some of this sort of evangelists; for so Eusebius[y], *Primaque apud eos fundamenta evangelii collocantes, atque electis quibusque ex ipsis officium regendæ ecclesiæ quam fundaverant com-*

[t] In Ephes. iv. [ver. 12. tom. ii. append. col. 241 C.]

[u] Hist. eccles., lib. iii. cap. 37. [Ruffin. interpr. p. 69.]

[x] [Ed. 'ardentiore d. p. cupiditate succensi.']

[y] [Ubi supra.]

mittentes, ipsi rursum ad alias gentes properabant. So that they first converted the nation, and then governed the church; first they were evangelists, and afterwards bishops; and so was Austin the monk that converted England in the time of St. Gregory and Ethelbert, he was first our evangelist and afterwards bishop of Dover. Nay, why may they not in this sense be both evangelists and bishops at the same time? insomuch as many bishops have first planted christianity in divers countries, as St. Chrysostom in Scythia[a], St. Trophimus, St. Denis, St. Mark, and many more.—By the way only, according to all these acceptations of the word 'evangelist,' this office does not imply a perpetual motion: evangelists many of them did travel, but they were never the more evangelists for that; but only their office was writing or preaching the gospel, and thence they had their name.

4. The office of an evangelist was but temporary, and, take it in either of the two senses of Eusebius or Œcumenius, which are the only true and genuine, was to expire when christianity was planted every where: and the office of episcopacy, if it was at all, was to be succeeded in; and therefore in no respect could these be inconsistent, at least not always. And how St. Paul[a] should intend that Timothy should keep those rules he gave him "to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," if the office for the execution of which he gave him the rules was to expire long before, is not so easily imagined. For if St. Paul did direct him in a temporary and expiring office, then in no sense, neither in person nor in succession, could those rules of St. Paul be kept till Christ's coming, to wit, to judgment. But if he instructed him in the perpetual office of episcopacy, then it is easy to understand that St. Paul gave that caution to Timothy, to intimate that those his directions were not personal, but for his successors in that charge to which he had ordained him, viz., in the sacred order and office of episcopacy.

5. Lastly, after all this stir, there are some of the fathers that will by no means admit St. Timothy to have been an evangelist; so St. Chrysostom[b], so Theophylact[c], so the Greek scholiast: now though we have no need to make any use of it, yet if it be true, it makes all this discourse needless, we were safe enough without it; if it be false, then itself we see is needless, for the allegation of St. Timothy's being an evangelist is absolutely impertinent though it had been true.—But now I proceed.

§ 15. St. Titus at Crete. Titus was also made a bishop by the apostles; St. Paul also was his ordainer.

First, *Reliqui te Cretæ;* there St. Paul fixed his seat for him, at Crete.

[a] Tripart. hist., lib. x. cap. 5, [p. 355, post] Theodoret. [Hist. eccl. v. 30.]

[a] [1 Tim. vi. 14.]

[b] In Ephes. iv. [ver. 11. tom. xi. p. 83 C.]

[c] [In eund. loc. p. 536.]

Secondly, his work was,

I. Τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθῶσαι, 'to set in order things that are wanting;' viz., to constitute rites and forms of public liturgy, to erect a consistory for cognizance of causes criminal, to dedicate houses for prayer by public destination for divine service, and in a word, by his authority to establish such discipline and rituals as himself did judge to be most for edification and ornament of the church of God; for he that was appointed by St. Paul to rectify and set things in order, was most certainly by him supposed to be the judge of all the obliquities which he was to rectify.

II. The next work is episcopal too, and it is the 'ordaining presbyters in every city;' not presbyters collectively in every city, but distributively, κατὰ πόλιν, 'city by city;' that is, elders in several cities, one in one city[d], many in many; for by these 'elders,' are certainly meant 'bishops.' Of the identity of names I shall afterwards give an account, but here it is plain St. Paul expounds himself to mean bishops;—

1. In terms and express words; to "ordain elders in every city; if any be the husband of one wife," &c.; "for a bishop must be blameless;" that is, 'the elders that you are to ordain in several cities must be blameless, for else they must not be bishops.'

2. The word πρεσβυτέρους cannot hinder this exposition, for St. Peter calls himself συμπρεσβύτερον· and St. John, *presbyter electæ dominæ*, and *presbyter dilectissimo Gaio;* such presbyters as these were apostolical, and that's as much as episcopal, to be sure.

3. St. Paul adds further, "A bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God[e]." "Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord shall make ruler?" St. Paul's bishop is 'God's steward;' and 'God's steward' is the 'ruler of His household,' says our blessed Saviour himself; and therefore not a mere presbyter; amongst whom, indeed, there is a parity, but no superintendency of God's making.

4. St. Paul does in the sequel still qualify his elders or bishops with more proprieties of rulers, "A bishop must be no striker, not given to wine." They are exactly the requisites which our blessed Saviour exacts in His stewards' or rulers' accounts. "If the steward of the house will drink and be drunk, and beat his fellow-servants, then the Lord of that servant shall come and divide him his portion with unbelievers." The 'steward of the household,' this ruler, must not be πάροινος, nor πλήκτης; no more must a bishop; he must not be 'given to wine; no striker.' *Neque enim pugilem describit sermo apostolicus, sed pontificem instituit quid facere non debeat,* saith St. Hierome[f]. Still then these are the rulers of the church,

[d] [But see Bp. Hall, "Episcopacy by divine right," part ii. § 5. fin.]

[e] [Tit. i. 7.]

[f] Adv. Jovinian. [lib. i. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 176.]

which St. Titus was to ordain, and therefore it is required should 'rule well his own house,' for 'how else shall he take charge of the church of God?' implying that this his charge is to rule the house of God.

5. The reason why St. Paul appointed him to ordain these bishops in cities is, in order to coercive[s] jurisdiction; because "many unruly and vain talkers were crept in," (verse 10,) and they were to be silenced; οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, 'their mouths must be stopped.' Therefore they must be such elders as had superiority of jurisdiction over these impertinent preachers, which to a single presbyter, either by divine or apostolical institution, no man will grant; and to a college of presbyters St. Paul does not intend it, for himself had given it singly to St. Titus. For I consider,

Titus alone had coercive[s] jurisdiction before he ordained these elders, be they bishops, be they presbyters. The presbyters which were at Crete before his coming had not episcopal power, or coercive[s] jurisdiction; for why then was Titus sent? As for the presbyters which Titus ordained, before his ordaining them to be sure they had no power at all, they were not presbyters. If they had a coercive[s] jurisdiction afterwards, to wit, by their ordination, then Titus had it before in his own person, (for they that were there before his coming had not, as I shewed,) and therefore he must also have it still, for he could not lose it by ordaining others; or if he had it not before, how could he give it unto them whom he ordained? For *plus juris in alium transferre nemo potest, quam ipse habet.*

Howsoever it be then, to be sure, Titus had it in his own person; and then it follows undeniably, that either this coercive[s] jurisdiction was not necessary for the church, (which would be either to suppose men impeccable, or the church to be exposed to all the inconveniences of schism and tumultuary factions without possibility of relief,) or if it was necessary, then, because it was in Titus not as a personal prerogative but a power to be succeeded to, he might ordain others, he had authority to do it, with the same power he had himself; and therefore since he alone had this coercion in his own person, so should his successors; and then because a single presbyter could not have it over his brethren by the confession of all sides, nor the college of presbyters which were there before his coming had it not, (for why then was Titus sent with a new commission?) nor those which he was to ordain if they were but mere presbyters could not have it, no more than the presbyters that were there before his coming; it follows that those elders which St. Paul sent Titus to ordain, being such as were to be constituted in opposition and power over the false doctors and prating preachers, and with authority to silence them (as is evident in the first chapter of that epistle), these elders, I say, are verily and indeed such as himself calls bishops in the proper sense and acceptation of the word.

[s] ['coercitive' A.]

6. The Cretan presbyters who were there before St. Titus's coming had not power to ordain others; that is, had not that power which Titus had, for Titus was sent thither for that purpose, therefore to supply the want of that power. And now, because to ordain others was necessary for the conservation and succession of the church,—that is, because new generations are necessary for the continuing the world,—and mere presbyters could not do it; and yet this must be done not only by Titus himself but after him; it follows undeniably that St. Paul sent Titus to ordain men with the same power that himself had; that is, with more than his first Cretan presbyters; that is, bishops, and he means them in the proper sense.

7. That by 'elders in several cities' he means 'bishops' is also plain from the place where they were to be ordained, *κατὰ πόλιν* not *κατὰ κώμην*, or *κατὰ πολίχνιον* 'in populous cities,' not 'in village-towns;' for no bishops were ever suffered to be in village-towns, as is to be seen in the councils of Sardis[h], of Chalcedon[i], and St. Leo[j]; the cities therefore do at least highly intimate that the persons to be ordained were not mere presbyters.

The issue of this discourse is that since Titus was sent to Crete to ordain bishops, himself was a bishop, to be sure, at least. If he had ordained only presbyters, it would have proved that; but this infers him to be a metropolitan, forasmuch as he was bishop of Crete, and yet had many suffragans in subordination to him, of his own constitution, and yet of proper dioceses. However, if this discourse concludes nothing peculiar, it frees the place from popular prejudice and mistakes upon the confusion of *episcopus* and *presbyter*, and at least infers his being a bishop, if not a great deal more.

Yea; but did not St. Titus ordain no[k] mere presbyters?

1. Yes, most certainly; but so he did deacons too, and yet neither one nor the other are otherwise mentioned in this epistle but by consequence and comprehension within the superior order. For he that ordains a bishop, first makes him a deacon, and then he obtains *καλὸν βαθμὸν*, 'a good degree;' and then a presbyter, and then a bishop; so that these inferior orders are presupposed in the authorizing the supreme, and by giving direction for the qualifications of bishops he sufficiently instructs the inferior orders in their deportment, insomuch as they are probations for advancement to the higher.

2. Add to this, that he that ordains bishops in cities sets there *τάξιν γεννητικὴν, ordinem generativum patrum*, as Epiphanius[l] calls episcopacy, and therefore most certainly with intention not that it should be *χεὶρ ἄκυρος, manus mortua*, but to produce others, and therefore presbyters and deacons.

[h] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 641.]
[i] Can. xvii. [qu. leg. Concil. Laod. can. lvii, et Francof. can. xxii.—tom. i. col. 791, et iv. col. 907.]
[j] Epist. lxxxvii. ad episc. Afric. [cap. 2. p. 158 A.]
[k] [sic edd.]
[l] [Hær. lxxv. § 4. p. 908 A.]

3. St. Paul made no express provision for villages, and yet most certainly did not intend to leave them destitute; and therefore he took order that such ordinations should be made in cities which should be provisionary for villages, and that is, of such men as had power to ordain and power to send presbyters to what part of their charge they pleased. For since presbyters could not ordain other presbyters, as appears by St. Paul's sending Titus to do it there where most certainly many presbyters before were actually resident; if presbyters had gone to villages, they must have left the cities destitute; or if they stayed in cities, the villages would have perished; and at last when these men had died, both one and the other had been made a prey to the wolf, for there could be no shepherd after the decay of the first generation.

III. But let us see further into St. Titus his commission and letters of orders, and institution. "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject[m]." Cognizance of heretical pravity, and animadversion against the heretic himself, is most plainly concredited to St. Titus; for first he is to admonish him, then to reject him, upon his pertinacy, from the catholic communion. *Cogere autem illos videtur, qui sæpe corripit,* saith St. Ambrose[n], upon the establishing a coactive or coercive[o] jurisdiction over the clergy and whole diocese.

But I need not specify any more particulars; for St. Paul committed to St. Titus πᾶσαν ἐπιταγὴν[p], 'all authority and power.' The consequence is that which St. Ambrose[q] prefixes to the commentary on this epistle, *Titum apostolus consecravit*[r] *episcopum, et ideo commonet eum ut sit solicitus in ecclesiastica ordinatione, id est, ad quosdam qui simulatione quadam dignos se ostentant ut sublimem ordinem teneant, simulque et hæreticos ex circumcisione corripiendos.*

And now after so fair preparatory of scripture we may hear the testimonies of antiquity witnessing that Titus was by St. Paul made bishop of Crete. *Sed et Lucas,* saith Eusebius[s], *in Actibus apostolorum . . Timothei meminit et Titi; quorum alter in Epheso episcopus, alter ordinandis apud Cretam ecclesiis ab eo ordinatus*[t] *præficitur.* That is it which St. Ambrose expresses something more plainly, *Titum apostolus consecravit*[r] *episcopum,* 'the apostle consecrated Titus bishop[u];' and Theodoret, calling Titus *Cretensium episcopum,* 'the bishop of the Cretians.' And for this reason, saith St. Chrysostom[x], St. Paul did not write to Silvanus, or Silas, or Clemens, but to Timothy and Titus, ὅτι τούτοις ἤδη ἐκκλησίας ἦν

[m] [Tit. iii. 10.]
[n] [In Tit. iii. 11. tom. ii. append. col. 316 F.]
[o] ['coercitive,' A.]
[p] [Tit. ii. 15.]
[q] [Ubi supra, col. 313 A.]
[r] ['creavit,' ed.]
[s] Hist. eccles., lib. iii. cap. 4. [Ruffin. interpr., p. 47.]
[t] [Deest 'ordinatus.']
[u] Ubi supra.
[x] In 1 Tim. [argum.—tom. xi. p. 547.]

ἐγκεχειρικὼς, 'because to these he had already committed the government of churches.' But a fuller testimony of St. Titus being a bishop who please may see in St. Hierome[y], in Dorotheus[z], in Isidore[a], in Vincentius[b], in Theodoret[c], in St. Gregory[d], in Primasius[e], in Sedulius[f], Theophylact[g], and Nicephorus[h]. To which if we add the subscription of the epistle, asserted from all impertinent objections by the clearer testimony of St. Athanasius[i], St. Hierome[j], the Syriac translation[k], Œcumenius[l], and Theophylact[m], no confident denial can ever break through, or 'scape conviction.

And now I know not what objection can fairly be made here; for I hope St. Titus was no 'evangelist.' He is not called so in scripture, and all antiquity calls him a bishop; and the nature of his offices, the eminence of his dignity, the superiority of jurisdiction, the cognizance of causes criminal, and the whole exigence of the epistle, proclaim him bishop. But suppose awhile Titus had been an evangelist, I would fain know who succeeded him? or did all his office expire with his person? If so, then who shall reject heretics when Titus is dead? who shall silence factious preachers? If not, then still who succeeded him? the presbyters? How can that be? for if they had more power after his death than before, and governed the churches which before they did not, then to be sure their government in common is not an apostolical ordinance, much less is it a divine right, for it is postnate to them both; but if they had no more power after Titus than they had under him, how then could they succeed him? there was indeed a dereliction of the authority, but no succession. The succession therefore both in the metropolis of Crete and also in the other cities, was made by singular persons, not by a college; for so we find in the διαδοχαὶ recorded by Eusebius, that in Gnossus of Crete Pinytus was a most eminent bishop, and that Philip was the metropolitan at Gortyna; *Sed et Pinytus nobilissimus apud Cretam in episcopis fuit*, saith Eusebius[n]. But of this enough.

§ 16. St. Mark at Alexandria. My next instance shall be of one that was an evangelist indeed, one that writ the gospel, and he was a bishop of Alexandria. In scripture we find nothing of him

[y] De scriptt. eccles. in Tito. [vid. p. 34. not. e. supr.]
[z] In synops. [p. 148.]
[a] De vita et morte ss. [cap. 58.—tom. vii. p. 396.]
[b] Lib. xxxviii. cap. 10. [qu. Vincent. Bellovac., lib. x. cap. 38.]
[c] Apud Œcumen. in præfat. in Tit. [p. 785.] et in 1 Timoth. [p. 741.]
[d] In pastor., part. ii. cap. 11.
[e] Præfat. in 1 Tim. et in 2 Tim. i. [?]
[f] In 1 Tim. i. et in 2 Tim. i. 6.[?]
[g] In Tit. i. [ver. 2, et al. p. 840 sqq.]
[h] Lib. ii. cap. 34. [tom. i. p. 189.]
[i] In synops. sacr. script. [§ 71. tom. ii. p. 199 D.]
[j] Ad Paulum et Eustoch. [qu. 'Ad Evangelum.' ep. ci. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 802.]
[k] [The subscription which speaks of Titus as a bishop is not found in the old Syriac version, but only in the Philoxenian, which is probably a translation from the Greek.]
[l] Comment. ad Titum. [p. 792.]
[m] Ibid. [p. 837.]
[n] Lib. iv. cap. 21. [Ruffin. interpr., p. 90.]

but that he was an evangelist, and a deacon, for he was deacon to St. Paul and Barnabas when they went to the gentiles, by ordination and special designment made at Antioch; *συμπαραλαβόντες Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον* 'they had John to be their minister;' viz. 'John whose surname was Mark[p].' But we are not to expect all the ordinations made by the apostles in their Acts written by St. Luke, which end at St. Paul's first going to Rome; but many other things, their founding of divers churches, their ordination of bishops, their journeys, their persecutions, their miracles and martyrdoms, are recorded, and rely upon the faith of the primitive church. And yet the ordination of St. Mark was within the term of St. Luke's story, for his successor Anianus was made bishop of Alexandria in the eighth year of Nero's reign, five or six years before the death of St. Paul. *Igitur Neronis primo imperii anno post Marcum evangelistam ecclesiæ apud Alexandriam Anianus sacerdotium suscepit*, so the Latin of Ruffinus[q] reads it instead of *octavo*. *Sacerdotium*, λειτουργίαν, that is, 'the bishopric;' for else there were many λειτουργοὶ and priests in Alexandria besides him; and how then he should be St. Mark's successor more than the other presbyters, is not so soon to be contrived. But so the *collecta* of the chapter runs, *Quod post Marcum primus episcopus Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ ordinatus sit Anianus*, 'Anianus was consecrated the first bishop of Alexandria after St. Mark.' And Philo the Jew telling the story of the Christians in Alexandria, called by the inhabitants *cultores* and *cultrices*, 'the worshippers,' *Addit autem adhuc his*, saith Eusebius[r], *quomodo sacerdotes vel ministri exhibeant officia sua, vel quæ sit supra omnia episcopalis apicis sedes*; intimating that beside the offices of priests and ministers there was an episcopal dignity, which was *apex super omnia*, 'a height above all employments,' established at Alexandria; and how soon that was is soon computed, for Philo lived in our blessed Saviour's time, and was ambassador to the emperor Caius, and survived St. Mark a little.

But St. Hierome[s] will strike up this business. *A Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri Ægypti semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant.* And again, *Marcus interpres apostoli Petri, et Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ primus episcopus.* The same is witnessed by St. Gregory[t], Nicephorus[u], and divers others.

Now although the ordination of St. Mark is not specified in the Acts, as innumerable multitudes of things more, and scarce any thing at all of any of the twelve but St. Peter, nothing of St. James the son

[p] [Acts xii. 25, and xiii. 5.]

[q] [Lib. ii. cap. 24. p. 43.]

[r] [Hist. eccles. Ruffin. interpr., lib. ii. cap. 17. p. 37.]

[s] Epist. ad Evagr. [al. 'ad Evangelum.'—tom. iv. part. 2. col. 803.—'Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper,' &c.]—De scriptt. eccles. [ibid., col. 104,] et in procem. in Matth. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 3.]

[t] Lib. vi. ep. 371. [leg. lib. vii. ep. 37. al. 40. tom. ii. col. 887 sqq.]

[u] Lib. xiv. cap. 39. [tom. ii. p. 525.]

Thaddeus, nor of Alpheus, but the martyrdom of one of them; thing of St. Bartholomew, of St. Thomas, of Simon Zelotes, of . Jude the apostle; scarce any of their names recorded; yet no wise an can distrust the faith of such records which all christendom itherto, so far as we know, hath acknowledged as authentic; and hese ordinations cannot possibly go less than apostolical, being done in the apostles' times, to whom the care of all the churches was con- credited, they seeing and beholding several successions in several churches before their death; as here at Alexandria, first St. Mark, then Anianus, made bishop five or six years before the death of St. Peter and St. Paul. But yet who it was that ordained St. Mark bishop of Alexandria (for bishop he was most certainly) is not ob- scurely intimated by the most excellent man St. Gelasius[x], in the Roman council, *Marcus a Petro apostolo in Ægyptum directus, verbum veritatis prædicavit, et gloriosum consummavit martyrium.* St. Peter sent him into Egypt to found a church, and therefore would fur- nish him with all things requisite for so great employment; and that could be no less than the ordinary power apostolical.

§ 17. St. Linus and St. Clement at Rome.

But in the church of Rome the ordination of bishops by the apostles, and their successions during the times of the apostles, is very manifest by a con- current testimony of old writers. *Fundantes igitur et instruentes beati apostoli ecclesiam Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt; hujus Lini Paulus in his quæ sunt ad Timotheum epistolis meminit. Succedit autem ei Anacletus; post eum tertio loco ab apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens, qui et vidit ipsos apostolos, et contulit cum eis, cum adhuc insonantem prædicationem apostolorum et traditionem ante oculos haberet;* so St. Irenæus[y]. *Memoratur autem ex comitibus Pauli Crescens quidam ad Gallias esse præfectus, Linus vero et Clemens in urbe Roma ecclesiæ præ- fuisse*[z]. Many more testimonies there are of these men's being ordained bishops of Rome by the apostles; as of Tertullian[a], Op- tatus[b], St. Augustine[c], and St. Hierome[d]. But I will not cloy my reader with variety of one dish, and be tedious in a thing so evident and known.

§ 18. St. Polycarp at Smyrna, and divers others.

St. John ordained St. Polycarp bishop at Smyrna. *Sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia habens*[e] *Polycarpum ab Johanne collocatum refert; sicut Romanorum, Cle- mentem a Petro ordinatum edit*[e]*, proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent*

[x] In Decret. de lib. authent. et apocryph. [Concil. Reg., tom. x. p. 209.]
[y] Lib. iii. cap. 3. [§ 3. p. 176.]
[z] Euseb., lib. iii. cap. 4. [Ruffin. interpr., p. 47.]
[a] De præscript. [cap. xxxii. p. 213 B.]
[b] Cont. Parmen., lib. ii. [cap. 2 sq. p. 31.]
[c] Ep. clxv. [Ben. liii. tom. ii. col. 120 F.]
[d] De scriptt. eccles. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 107.]
[e] ['habens,' 'edit,' desunt.]

quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant, so Tertullian[f]; 'the church of Smyrna saith that Polycarp was placed there by St. John, as the church of Rome saith that Clement was ordained there by St. Peter, and other churches have those whom the apostles made to be their bishops.' *Polycarpus autem non solum ab apostolis edoctus . . sed etiam ab apostolis in Asia, in ea quæ est Smyrnis ecclesia, constitutus episcopus: testimonium his perhibent quæ sunt in Asia ecclesiæ omnes et qui usque adhuc successerunt Polycarpo, &c.;* the same also is witnessed by St. Hierome[g], and Eusebius[h]. *Quoniam autem valde longum est in tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones,* to use St. Irenæus[i] his expression; it were an infinite labour to reckon up all those whom the apostles made bishops with their own hands, as St. Dionysius[k] the Areopagite at Athens, Caius[l] at Thessalonica, Archippus[m] at Colosse, Onesimus[n] at Ephesus, Antipas[o] at Pergamus, Epaphroditus[p] at Philippi, Crescens[q] among the Gauls, Evodius[r] at Antioch, Sosipater[s] at Iconium, Erastus in Macedonia, Trophimus at Arles, Jason at Tarsus, Silas at Corinth, Onesiphorus at Colophon, Quartus at Berytus, Paul the proconsul at Narbona, besides many more whose names are not recorded in scripture as these fore-cited are, so many as Eusebius[t] counts impossible to enumerate; it shall therefore suffice to sum up this digest of their acts and ordinations in those general foldings used by the fathers, saying that the apostles did ordain bishops in all churches, that the succession of bishops down from the apostles' first ordination of them was the only argument to prove their churches catholic, and their adversaries' who could not do so, to be heretical. This also is very evident, and of great consideration in the first ages, while their tradition was clear and evident, and not so bepuddled as it since hath been with the mixture of heretics, striving to spoil that which did so much mischief to their causes.

Edant origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris . . habuerit auctorem et antecessorem; hoc modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos de-

[f] De præscript. [cap. xxxii. p. 213 B.]
[g] De scriptt. eccles. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 108.]
[h] [Hist. eccles. iii. 36.]
[i] [Lib. iii. cap. 3. §§ 4, 2. pp. 176, et præced.]
[k] Ibid. [iv. 23, et iii. 4.]
[l] Origen. in Epist. ad Rom., lib. x. [§ 41. tom. iv. p. 687.]
[m] S. Ambros. in Coloss. iv. [17.—tom. ii. append. col. 276 E.]
[n] Ignat. ep. ad Eph. [§ 1. p. 12,] et Euseb. [H. E. iii. 36.]
[o] Arethas in 1 Apocal. [leg. ii. 13. p. 897.]
[p] Epist. ad Phil. [ii. 25.] et Theodoret. ib., [tom. iii. p. 459.—cf. in cap. i. 2. p. 446 init.] et in 1 Tim. iii. [p. 652.]
[q] Euseb., lib. iii. cap. 4.—'Apud Gallias,' so Ruffinus reads it [p. 47.] 'In Galatia,' so is intimated in scripture, [2 Tim. iv. 10,] and so the Roman martyrology. [in Jun. xxvii.—Sed vid. etiam in Decemb. xxix.]
[r] Ignat. ep. ad Antioch. [§ 7. p. 106,] et Euseb. [lib. iii. cap. 22.]
[s] In martyrol. Rom. [in Jun. xxv.]
[t] [Hist. eccles., lib. iii. cap. 37.]

ferunt, &c. And when St. Irenæus[u] had reckoned twelve successions in the church of Rome from the apostles, *nunc duodecimo loco episcopatum ab apostolis habet Eleutherius: hac ordinatione,* saith he, *et successione ea quæ est ab apostolis in ecclesia traditio et veritatis præconatio pervenit usque ad nos; et est plenissima hæc ostensio unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in ecclesia ab apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate.* So that this succession of bishops from the apostles' ordination must of itself be a very certain thing, when the church made it a main probation of their faith; for the books of scripture were not all gathered together and generally received as yet. Now then, since this was a main pillar of their christianity, viz., a constant reception of it from hand to hand as being delivered by the bishops in every chair till we come to the very apostles that did ordain them; this I say being their proof, although it could not be more certain than the thing to be proved, which in that case was a divine revelation, yet to them it was more evident as being matter of fact, and known almost by evidence of sense, and as verily believed by all as it was by any one that himself was baptized, both relying upon the report of others. *Radix christianæ societatis per sedes apostolorum et successiones episcoporum certa per orbem propagatione diffunditur,* saith St. Augustine[x]; 'the very root and foundation of christian communion is spread all over the world by the successions of apostles and bishops.'

And is it not now a madness to say there was no such thing, no succession of bishops in the churches apostolical, no ordination of bishops by the apostles, and so, as St. Paul's phrase is, "overthrow the faith of some," even of the primitive Christians, that used this argument as a great weapon of offence against the invasion of heretics and factious people? It is enough for us that we can truly say, with St. Irenæus[y], *Habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis . . usque ad nos,* 'we can reckon those who from the apostles until now were made bishops in the churches;' and of this we are sure enough, if there be any faith in Christians.

§ 19. So that episcopacy is at least an apostolical ordinance, of the same authority with many other points generally believed.

The sum is this. Although we had not proved the immediate divine institution of episcopal power over presbyters and the whole flock, yet episcopacy is not less than an apostolical ordinance, and delivered to us by the same authority that the observation of the Lord's day is. For for that in the New testament we have no precept, and nothing but the example of the primitive disciples meeting in their *synaxes* upon that day, and so also they did on the Saturday in the Jewish synagogues, but yet (however that at Geneva they were once in meditation to have changed it into a

[u] Lib. iii. cap. 3. [§ 3. p. 176.]
[x] Epist. xlii. [Ben. ccxxxii. tom. ii. col. 843 E.]
[y] Ubi supra. [§ 1. p. 175.]

Thursday meeting, to have shewn their christian liberty) we should think strangely of those men that called the Sunday festival less than an apostolical ordinance, and necessary now to be kept holy with such observances as the church hath appointed.

Baptism of infants is most certainly a holy and charitable ordinance, and of ordinary necessity to all that ever cried, and yet the church hath founded this rite upon the tradition of the apostles; and wise men do easily observe that the anabaptists can by the same probability of scripture enforce a necessity of communicating infants upon us, as we do of baptizing infants upon them, if we speak of immediate divine institution, or of practice apostolical recorded in scripture; and therefore a great master of Geneva, in a book he writ against the anabaptists, was forced to fly to apostolical traditive ordination: and therefore the institution of bishops must be served first, as having fairer plea and clearer evidence in scripture than the baptizing of infants, and yet they that deny this are by the just *anathema* of the catholic church confidently condemned for heretics.

Of the same consideration are divers other things in christianity, as the presbyters consecrating the eucharist; for if the apostles in the first institution did represent the whole church, clergy and laity, when Christ said *Hoc facite,* 'do this,' then why may not every christian man there represented do that which the apostles in the name of all were commanded to do? if the apostles did not represent the whole church, why then do all communicate? or what place or intimation of Christ's saying is there in all the four gospels, limiting *hoc facite, id est, benedicite,* to the clergy, and extending *hoc facite, id est, accipite et manducate,* to the laity? This also rests upon the practice apostolical and traditive interpretation of holy church, and yet cannot be denied that so it ought to be, by any man that would not have his christendom suspected.

To these I add the communion of women, the distinction of books apocryphal from canonical, that such books were written by such evangelists and apostles, the whole tradition of scripture itself, the apostles' creed, the feast of Easter, which amongst all them that cry up the Sunday festival for a divine institution must needs prevail as *caput institutionis,* it being that for which the Sunday is commemorated: these and divers others of greater consequence which I dare not specify for fear of being misunderstood, rely but upon equal faith with this of episcopacy (though I should wave all the arguments for immediate divine ordinance), and therefore it is but reasonable it should be ranked amongst the *credenda* of christianity, which the church hath entertained upon the confidence of that which we call 'the faith of a Christian,' whose Master is truth itself.

§ 20. And was an office of power and great authority.

What their power and eminence was, and the appropriates of their office so ordained by the apostles, appears also by the testimonies before alleged, the expressions whereof run in these high terms, *Episcopatus administrandæ ecclesiæ in Lino*[z], 'Linus his bishopric was the administration of the whole church.' *Ecclesiæ præfuisse* was said of him and Clemens; they were both 'prefects of the church,' or 'prelates;' that's the church word. *Ordinandis apud Cretam ecclesiis præficitur*[a], so Titus, 'he is set over all the affairs of the new-founded churches in Crete.' *In excelsiori gradu collocatus*[a], 'placed in a higher order or degree,' so the bishop of Alexandria, chosen *ex presbyteris*, 'from amongst the presbyters.' *Supra omnia episcopalis apicis sedes*, so Philo[a] of that bishopric, 'the seat of episcopal height above all things in christianity:' these are its honours.—Its offices these, τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθῶσαι, ἐπιστομίζειν ἀνυποτάκτους καὶ ματαιολόγους, κ.τ.λ. 'to set in order whatsoever he sees wanting or amiss, to silence vain prating preachers that will not submit to their superiors, to ordain elders, to rebuke delinquents, to reject heretics,' viz., from the communion of the faithful, (for else why was the angel of the church of Pergamus reproved for tolerating the Nicolaitan heretics, but that it was in his power to eject them? and the same is the case of the angel of Thyatira in permitting the woman to teach and seduce the people;) but to the bishop was committed the cognizance of causes criminal, and particularly of presbyters, (so to Timothy in the instance formerly alleged,) nay, πᾶσα ἐπιταγή, 'all authority,' so in the case of Titus, and *officium regendæ ecclesiæ*, 'the office of ruling the church,' so to them all whom the apostles left in the several churches respectively which they had new founded; so Eusebius[a]. For the bishop was ἐπὶ πᾶσι καθεστὼς, 'set over all,' clergy and laity, saith St. Clement[b].

This was given to bishops by the apostles themselves, and this was not given to presbyters, as I have already proved; and for the present it will sufficiently appear in this, that bishops had power over presbyters, which cannot be supposed they had over themselves, unless they could be their own superiors.

§ 21. Not lessened by the assistance and counsel of presbyters.

But a council, or college of presbyters, might have jurisdiction over any one, and such colleges there were in the apostles' times, and they did *in communi*[c] *ecclesiam regere*, 'govern the church in common with the bishop,' as saith St. Hierome[d], viz., where there was a bishop; and where there was none they ruled without him. This indeed

[z] [Vid. §§ 17, 15, 16, supra.]
[a] Ubi supra.
[b] Apud Euseb. [lib. iii. cap. 23.—Clem. Alex. in libro, 'Quis dives salvetur,' § 42. p. 959.]
[c] [al. 'in commune.']
[d] Comment. in Ep. ad Titum. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 413.]

will call us to a new account; and it relies upon the testimony of St. Hierome, which I will set down here, that we may leave the sun without a cloud. St. Hierome's words are these, *Idem est enim presbyter qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, Ego Apollo, Ego autem Cephæ, communi presbyterorum concilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur; postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, . . et schismatum semina tollerentur.* Then he brings some arguments to confirm his saying, and sums them up thus, *Hæc diximus ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos et episcopos, et ut episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dominicæ dispositionis veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in communi debere ecclesiam regere*[e], *&c.*

The thing St. Hierome aims to prove is the identity of bishop, presbyter, and their government of the church in common. For their identity, it is clear that St. Hierome does not mean it in respect of order, as if a bishop and a presbyter had both one office *per omnia*, one power; for else he contradicts himself most apertly: for in his epistle *ad Evagrium*[f], *Quid facit*, saith he, *episcopus excepta ordinatione quod presbyter non faciat?* 'a presbyter may not ordain, a bishop does;' which is a clear difference of power, and by St. Hierome is not expressed in matter of fact, but of right, *quod presbyter non faciat*, not *non facit;* that a priest 'may not,' 'must not' do, that a bishop does, viz., he gives holy orders. And for matter of fact, St. Hierome knew that in his time a presbyter did not govern in common; but because he conceived it was fit he should be joined in the common regiment and care of the diocese, therefore he asserted it as much as he could; and therefore if St. Hierome had thought that this difference of the power of ordination had been only customary, and by actual indulgence, or encroachment, or positive constitution, and no matter of primitive and original right, St. Hierome was not so diffident but out it should, come what would have come. And suppose St. Hierome, in this distinct power of ordination, had intended it only to be a difference in fact, not in right, (for so some of late have muttered,) then St. Hierome had not said true according to his own principles, for *Quid facit episcopus excepta ordinatione quod presbyter non faciat?* had been quickly answered if the question had only been *de facto;* for the bishop governed the church alone, and so in jurisdiction was greater than presbyters, and this was by custom, and in fact at least, St. Hierome says it, and the bishop took so much power to himself that *de facto* presbyters were not suffered to do any thing *sine literis episcopalibus*[g], 'without leave of the bishop;' and this St. Hierome[h] complained of; so that

[e] [Vid. ut supra.]

[f] [al. 'ad Evangelum.'—tom. iv. part. 2. col. 803.]

[g] [Vid. concil. Ancyr. can. xii., tom. i. col. 275.]

[h] Ad Nepotian. [tom. iv. part. 2. col.

de facto the power of ordination was not the only difference. That then (if St. Hierome says true) being the only difference between presbyter and bishop, must be meant *de jure*, in matter of right, not human positive (for that is coincident with the other power of jurisdiction, which *de facto*, and at least by a human right, the bishop had over presbyters) but divine; and then this identity of bishop and presbyter by St. Hierome's own confession cannot be meant in respect of order, but that episcopacy is by divine right a superior order to the presbyterate.

Add to this, that the arguments which St. Hierome uses in this discourse are to prove that bishops are sometimes called presbyters. To this purpose he urges[i] Acts xx., and Philippians i., and the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and some others, but all driving to the same issue; to what? not to prove that presbyters are sometimes called presbyters, for who doubts that? but that bishops are so, may be of some consideration, and needs a proof, and this he undertook. Now that they are so called, must needs infer an identity, and a disparity, in several respects; an identity, at least of names, for else it had been wholly impertinent; a disparity, or else his arguments were to prove *idem affirmari de eodem;* which were a business next to telling pins. Now then this disparity must be either in order or jurisdiction: by the former probation it is sure that he means the orders to be disparate; if jurisdiction too, I am content; but the former is most certain, if he stand to his own principles.

This identity then which St. Hierome expresses of *episcopus* and *presbyter*, must be either in name or in jurisdiction. I know not certainly which he means, for his arguments conclude only for the identity of names, but his conclusion is for identity of jurisdiction; *Et in communi*[k] *debere ecclesiam regere*[l], is the intent of his discourse. If he means the first, viz., that of names, it is well enough, there is no harm done, it is *in confesso apud omnes*, but concludes nothing, as I shall shew hereafter; but because he intends, so far as may be guessed by his words, a parity and concurrence of jurisdiction, this must be considered distinctly.

First then, in the first founding of churches the apostles did appoint presbyters and inferior ministers, with a power of baptizing, preaching, consecrating, and reconciling *in privato foro;* but did not in every church at the first founding it constitute a bishop: this is evident in Crete, in Ephesus, in Corinth, at Rome, at Antioch.

Secondly, where no bishops were constituted, there the apostles kept the jurisdiction in their own hands, "There comes upon me," saith St. Paul, "daily the care" or supravision "of all the churches." Not all absolutely, for not all of the circumcision, but all of his charge, with which he was once charged, and of which he had not

261.] et de Sept. ordin. eccles. [tom. v. col. 104 sq.]

[i] [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 802.]

[k] [al. 'in commune.']

[l] [In Tit. i. 5.—tom. iv. part. 1. col. 414.]

exonerated himself by constituting bishops there, for of these there is the same reason. And again[m], "If any man obey not our word, *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε*, signify him to me by an epistle;" so he charges the Thessalonians, and therefore of this church St. Paul as yet clearly kept the power in his own hands. So that the church was ever, in all the parts of it, governed by episcopal or apostolical authority.

Thirdly, for aught appears in scripture the apostles never gave any external or coercitive jurisdiction in public and criminal causes, nor yet power to ordain rites or ceremonies, or to inflict censures, to a college of mere presbyters. The contrary may be greedily swallowed, and I know not with how great confidence and prescribing prejudice; but there is not in all scripture any commission from Christ, any ordinance or warrant from the apostles to any presbyter, or college of presbyters without a bishop, or express delegation of apostolical authority *tanquam vicario suo*, 'as to his substitute' in absence of the bishop or apostle, to inflict any censures, or take cognizance of persons and causes criminal. Presbyters might be *surrogati in locum episcopi absentis*, but never had any ordinary jurisdiction given them by virtue of their ordination, or any commission from Christ or His apostles.

This we may best consider by induction of particulars.

1. There was a presbytery at Jerusalem, but they had a bishop always, and the college of the apostles sometimes; therefore whatsoever act they did, it was in conjunction with, and subordination to, the bishop and apostles. Now it cannot be denied, both that the apostles were superior to all the presbyters in Jerusalem, and also had power alone to govern the church. I say they had power to govern alone, for they had the government of the church alone before they ordained the first presbyters, that is, before there were any of capacity to join with them, they must do it themselves, and then also they must retain the same power, for they could not lose it by giving orders. Now if they had a power of sole jurisdiction, then the presbyters being in some public acts in conjunction with the apostles cannot challenge a right of governing as affixed to their order, they only assisting in subordination and by dependency.

This only by the way:—In Jerusalem the presbyters were something more than ordinary, and were not mere presbyters in the present and limited sense of the word. For Barnabas and Judas and Silas (*ἀνδρὰς ἡγουμένους* St. Luke[n] calls them) were of that presbytery, *καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται ὄντες*· they were rulers and prophets, chief men amongst the brethren, and yet called elders or presbyters though of apostolical power and authority, *ὅτι καὶ πρεσβυτέρων εἶχον ἀξίαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι*, saith Œcumenius[o]. For truth is that divers of them

[m] [2 Thess. iii. 14.]
[n] Acts xv. [ver. 22.]
[o] In Act. Apost. ['Ενθά ἐστι στοχάσασθαι ὅτι ἄλλην τινὰ ἀξίαν ὑπεραβαίνου-

were ordained apostles with an unlimited jurisdiction, not fixed upon any see, that they also might together with the twelve *exire in totum mundum*. So that in this presbytery, either they were more than mere presbyters, as Barnabas and Judas and Silas, men of apostolical power, and they might well be in conjunction with the twelve; and with the bishop they were of equal power, not by virtue of their presbyterate but by their apostolate: or if they were but mere presbyters, yet because it is certain and proved and confessed that the apostles had power to govern the church alone, this their taking mere *presbyteros in partem regiminis* was a voluntary act, and from this example was derived to other churches; and then it is most true that *presbyteros in communi ecclesiam regere* was rather *consuetudine ecclesiæ quam dominicæ dispositionis veritate*, to use St. Hierome's own expression; for this is more evident than that bishops do *eminere cæteris* by custom rather than divine institution. For if the apostles might rule the church alone, then that the presbyters were taken into the number was a voluntary act of the apostles; and although fitting to be retained where the same reasons do remain and circumstances concur, yet not necessary because not affixed to their order; not *dominicæ dispositionis veritate*, and not laudable when those reasons cease, and there is an emergency of contrary causes.

2. The next presbytery we read of is at Antioch[p]; but there we find no acts either of concurrent or single jurisdiction, but of ordination indeed we do, and that performed by such men as St. Paul was, and Barnabas, for they were two of the prophets reckoned in the church of Antioch, but I do not remember them to be called 'presbyters' in that place; to be sure they were not mere presbyters as we now understand the word; as I proved formerly[q].

3. But in the church of Ephesus[r] there was a college of presbyters, and they were by the Spirit of God called bishops, and were appointed by Him to be pastors of the church of God. This must do it or nothing. *In quo Spiritus S. posuit vos episcopos*[s], 'in whom the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops.' There must lie the exigence of the argument, and if we can find who is meant by *vos*, we shall I hope gain the truth.

St. Paul sent for the presbyters or elders to come from Ephesus to Miletus, and to them he spoke. It's true, but that's not all the *vos;* for there were present at that sermon Sopater, and Aristarchus, and Secundus, and Gaius, and Timothy, and Tychicus, and Trophimus[t], and although he sent to Ephesus as to the metropolis, and there many elders were, either accidentally or by ordinary residence, yet those were not all elders of that church, but of all Asia, in the

σαν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους εἶχον οἱ ἀπόστολοι, is Œcumenius' comment on Acts xv. 6. p. 72.]

[p] [Acts xiii.]

[q] [p. 26 sq. supra.]

[r] [Acts xx.]

[s] [ver. 28.]

[t] [ver. 4.]

scripture sense, the lesser Asia. For so in the preface of his sermon St. Paul intimates, "Ye know that from the first day I came into Asia after what manner I have been with you at all seasons[u];" his whole conversation in Asia was not confined to Ephesus, and yet those elders who were present were witnesses of it all, and therefore were of dispersed habitation; and so it is more clearly inferred from verse 25, "And now behold I know that ye all among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God," &c.; it was a travel[v] to preach to all that were present, and therefore most certainly they were inhabitants of places very considerably distant.

Now upon this ground I will raise these considerations.

1) If there be a confusion of names in scripture, particularly of *episcopus* and *presbyter*, as it is contended for on one side and granted on all sides, then where both the words are used, what shall determine the signification? For whether (to instance in this place) shall *presbyter* limit *episcopus* or *episcopus* extend *presbyter?* why may not *presbyter* signify one that is verily a bishop as *episcopus* signify a mere *presbyter?* For it is but an ignorant conceit, wherever *presbyter* is named to fancy it in the proper and limited sense, and not to do so with *episcopus;* and when they are joined together, rather to believe it in the limited and present sense of *presbyter*, than in the proper and present sense of *episcopus:* so that as yet we are indifferent upon the terms. These men sent for from Ephesus are called πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 'elders' or 'presbyters of the church;' but at Miletus, *Spiritus S. posuit vos episcopos*, there they are called 'bishops' or overseers. So that I may as well say, here were properly so called bishops, as another may say, here were mere presbyters. And lest it be objected in prejudice of my affirmative that they could not be bishops because they were of Ephesus, there never being but one bishop in one church; I answer, first, that in the apostles' times this was not true: for at Jerusalem there were many at the same time that had episcopal and apostolical authority, and so at Antioch; as at Jerusalem, where James, and Judas, and Silas, and the apostles; and Paul and Barnabas at Antioch; and at Rome at the same time Peter and Paul, and Linus, and Clemens; but yet but one of them was fixed, and properly the bishop of that place. But secondly, all these were not of Ephesus, but the elders of all Asia, but some from other countries, as appears ver. 4. So that although they were all bishops, we might easily find distinct dioceses for them without encumbering the church of Ephesus with a multiplied incumbency. Thus far then we are upon even terms; the community of compellations used here can no more force us to believe them all to be mere presbyters than bishops in the proper sense.

2) It is very certain that they were not all mere presbyters at his

[u] [ver. 18.] [v] ['travaile,' A; 'travell,' B; 'travel,' C.]

farewell sermon, for St. Timothy was there, and I proved him to be a bishop by abundant testimony; and many of those which are reckoned ver. 4, were companions of the apostle in his journey, and employed in mission apostolical for the founding of churches; and particularly Sopater was there, and he was bishop of Iconium, and Tychicus, of Chalcedon in Bithynia, as Dorotheus[x] and Eusebius[y] witness; and Trophimus, of Arles in France; for so it is witnessed by the suffragans of that province in their epistle to St. Leo. But without all doubt here were bishops present as well as presbyters, for besides the premises we have a witness beyond exception, the ancient St. Irenæus[z]; *In Mileto enim convocatis episcopis et presbyteris qui erant ab Epheso et a reliquis proximis civitatibus, quoniam ipse festinavit Hierosolymis pentecosten agere, &c.;* St. Paul, making haste to keep his pentecost at Jerusalem, 'at Miletus did call together the bishops and presbyters from Ephesus and the neighbouring cities.' Now to all these in conjunction St. Paul spoke, and to these indeed the Holy Ghost had concredited His church to be fed and taught with pastoral supravision; but in the meanwhile here is no commission of power or jurisdiction to presbyters distinctly, nor supposition of any such pre-existent power.

3) All that St. Paul said in this narration was spoken in the presence of them all, but not to them all. For that of verse 18, "Ye know how I have been with you in Asia in all seasons," that indeed was spoke to all the presbyters that came from Ephesus and the voisinage, viz., in a collective sense, not in a distributive, for each of them was not in all the circuit of his Asian travels; but this was not spoken to Sopater the Berean, or to Aristarchus the Thessalonian, but to Tychicus and Trophimus, who were Asians, it might be addressed. And for that of verse 25, "Ye all among whom I have gone preaching shall see my face no more," this was directed only to the Asians, for he was never more to come thither; but Timothy to be sure saw him afterwards, for St. Paul sent for him a little before his death to Rome, and it will not be supposed he neglected to attend him. So that if there were a conjunction of bishops and presbyters at this meeting, as most certainly there was, and of evangelists and apostolical men besides, how shall it be known, or indeed with any probability suspected, that that clause of verse 28, *Spiritus S. posuit vos episcopos pascere ecclesiam Dei*, does belong to the Ephesine presbyters, and not particularly to Timothy, who was now actually bishop of Ephesus, and to Gaius, and to the other apostolical men, who had at least episcopal authority, that is, power of founding and ordering churches without a fixed and limited jurisdiction.

4) Either in this place is no jurisdiction at all intimated *de antiquo*, or concredited *de novo*, or if there be, it is in the word

[x] [De lxxii. discipulis, p. 149 sq.] [y] [Vid. p. 25. not. n. supr.]
[z] Lib. iii. cap. 14. [§ 2. p. 201.]

ἐπισκόπους and ποιμαίνειν, verse 28, 'bishops' and 'feeders;' and then it belongs either to the bishops alone, or to the presbyters in conjunction with, and subordination to, the bishops; for to the mere presbyters it cannot be proved to appertain, by any intimation of that place.

5) How and if these presbyters which came from Ephesus and the other parts of Asia were made bishops at Miletus? then also this way all difficulty will be removed. And that so it was is more than probable; for to be sure Timothy was now entering and fixing upon his see; and it was consonant to the practice of the apostles and the exigence of the thing itself, when they were to leave a church, to fix a bishop in it; for why else was a bishop fixed in Jerusalem so long before any other churches, but because the apostles were to be scattered from thence, and there the first bloody field of martyrdom was to be fought; and the case was equal here, for St. Paul was never to see the churches of Asia any more, and he foresaw that ravening wolves would enter into the folds; and he had actually placed a bishop in Ephesus, and it is unimaginable that he would not make equal provision for other churches, there being the same necessity, from the same danger, in them all; and either St. Paul did it now or never; and that about this time the other six Asian churches had angels or bishops set in their candlesticks, is plain, for there had been a succession in the church of Pergamus, Antipas was dead, and St. Timothy had sate in Ephesus, and St. Polycarp at Smyrna, many years before St. John writ his revelation.

6) Lastly, that no jurisdiction was in the Ephesine presbyters, except a delegate and subordinate, appears beyond all exception by St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy, establishing in the person of Timothy power of coercitive jurisdiction over presbyters, and ordination in him alone, without the conjunction of any in commission with him, for aught appears either there or elsewhere.

4. The same also in the case of the Cretan presbyters is clear. For what power had they of jurisdiction? for that is it we now speak of. If they had none before St. Titus came, we are well enough at Crete; if they had, why did St. Paul take it from them to invest Titus with it? or if he did not, to what purpose did he send Titus with all those powers before-mentioned? For either the presbyters of Crete had jurisdiction in causes criminal equal to Titus after his coming, or they had not. If they had, then what did Titus do there? if they had not, then either they had no jurisdiction at all, or whatsoever it was, it was in subordination to him, they were his inferiors, and he their ordinary judge and governor.

5. One thing more before this be left must be considered concerning the church of Corinth, for there was power of excommunication in the presbytery when they had no bishop, for they had none of divers years after the founding of the church, and yet St. Paul reproves them for not ejecting the incestuous person out of the church.

This is it that I said before, that the apostles kept the jurisdiction in their hands where they had founded a church and placed no bishop, for in this case of the Corinthian incest the apostle did make himself the sole judge; "For I verily, as absent in body but present in spirit, have judged already[a];" and then secondly, St. Paul gives the church of Corinth commission and substitution to proceed in this cause, "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit," that is, 'my power, my authority,' for so he explains himself, "my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver him over to Satan." And thirdly, as all this power is delegate, so it is but declarative in the Corinthians, for St. Paul had given sentence before, and they of Corinth were to publish it. Fourthly, this was a commission given to the whole assembly, and no more concerns the presbyters than the people, and so some have contended; but so it is; but it will serve neither of their turns, neither for an independent presbytery, nor a conjunctive popularity. As for St. Paul's reproving them for not inflicting censures on the peccant, I have often heard it confidently averred, but never could see ground for it. The suspicion of it is ver. 2, "And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you;" taken away, but by whom? that's the question; not by them, to be sure; for 'taken away from you' implies that it is by the power of another, not by their act, for no man can take away any thing from himself, he may 'put it away,' not 'take it,' the expression had been very imperfect if this had been his meaning.—Well then, in all these instances, viz., of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Crete, and Corinth, (and these are all I can find in scripture of any consideration in the present question,) all the jurisdiction was originally in the apostles while there was no bishop, or in the bishop when there was any: and yet that the presbyters were joined in the ordering church affairs, I will not deny, to wit, by voluntary assuming them *in partem sollicitudinis*, and by delegation of power apostolical or episcopal, and by way of assistance in acts deliberative and consiliary, though I find this no where specified but in the church of Jerusalem, where I proved[b] that the elders were men of more power than mere presbyters, men of apostolical authority. But here lies the issue and strain of the question.

Presbyters had no jurisdiction in causes criminal and pertaining to the public regiment of the church, by virtue of their order or without particular substitution and delegation. For there is not in all scripture any commission given by Christ to mere presbyters, no divine institution of any power of regiment in the presbytery, no constitution apostolical that mere presbyters should either alone or in conjunction with the bishop govern the church, no example in all scripture of any censure inflicted by any mere presbyters either upon

[a] [1 Cor. v. 3 sqq.] [b] [p. 26 sq. supra.]

clergy or laity, no specification of any power that they had so to do; but to churches where colleges of presbyters were resident, bishops were sent by apostolical ordination, not only with power of imposition of hands but of excommunication, of taking cognizance even of causes and actions of presbyters themselves, as to Titus, and Timothy the angel of the church of Ephesus; and there is also example of delegation of power of censures from the apostle to a church where many presbyters were fixed, as in the case of the Corinthian delinquent before specified, which delegation was needless if coercitive jurisdiction by censures had been by divine right in a presbyter or a whole college of them.

Now then return we to the consideration of St. Hierome's saying, "The church was governed," saith he, *communi presbyterorum consilio*, "by the common counsel of presbyters." But,

1. *Quo jure* was this? That the bishops are superior to those which were then called presbyters, by custom rather than divine disposition, St. Hierome affirms; but that presbyters were joined with the apostles and bishops at first, by what right was that? was not that also by custom and condescension, rather than by divine disposition? St. Hierome does not say but it was; for he speaks only of matter of fact, not of right: it might have been otherwise, though *de facto* it was so in some places.

2. *Communi presbyterorum consilio* is true in the church of Jerusalem, where the elders were apostolical men, and had episcopal authority, and something superadded, as Barnabas and Judas and Silas, for they had the authority and power of bishops, and an unlimited diocese besides, though afterwards Silas was fixed upon the see of Corinth. But yet even at Jerusalem they actually had a bishop, who was in that place superior to them in jurisdiction, and therefore does clearly evince that the common counsel of presbyters is no argument against the superiority of a bishop over them.

3. *Communi presbyterorum consilio* is also true, because the apostles called themselves presbyters, as St. Paul and St. John in their epistles. Now at the first many prophets, many elders, (for the words are sometimes used in common,) were for a while resident in particular churches, and did govern in common; as at Antioch were Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Paul; *communi horum presbyterorum consilio* the church of Antioch for a time was governed, for all these were presbyters in the sense that St. Peter and St. John were, and the elders of the church of Jerusalem.

4. Suppose this had been true in the sense that any body please to imagine, yet this not being by any divine ordinance that presbyters should by their counsel assist in external regiment of the church, neither by any intimation of scripture nor by affirmation of St. Hierome, it is sufficient to stifle this by that saying of St. Ambrose[c], *postquam*

[c] In Ephes. iv. [ver. 12.—tom. ii. append. col. 241 D.]

in omnibus locis ecclesiæ sunt constitutæ et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est quam cœperat; it might be so at first *de facto*, and yet no need to be so, neither then nor after. For at first Ephesus had no bishop of its own, nor Crete, and there was no need, for St. Paul had the supravision of them, and St. John, and other of the apostles; but yet afterwards St. Paul did send bishops thither, for when themselves were to go away the power must be concredited to another; and if they in their absence before the constituting of a bishop had intrusted the care of the church with presbyters, yet it was but in dependence on the apostles and by substitution, not by any ordinary power, and it ceased at the presence or command of the apostle, or the sending of a bishop to reside. Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον, ἕως ἀναδείξῃ ὁ θεὸς τὸν μέλλοντα ἄρχειν ὑμῶν[d], so St. Ignatius being absent from his church upon a business of being persecuted, he writ to his presbyters, 'Do you feed the flock amongst you, till God shall shew you who shall be your ruler,' viz., 'my successor;' 'no longer, your commission expires when a bishop comes.'

5. To the conclusion of St. Hierome's discourse, viz., that 'bishops are not greater than presbyters by the truth of divine disposition,' I answer,

First, that this is true in this sense, Bishops are not by divine disposition greater than all those which in scripture are called presbyters, such as were the elders in the council at Jerusalem, such as were they of Antioch, such as St. Peter and St. John, συμπρεσβύτεροι all, and yet all of them were not bishops in the present sense, that is, of a fixed and particular diocese and jurisdiction. —Secondly, St. Hierome's meaning is also true in this sense, 'bishops by the truth of the Lord's disposition are not greater than presbyters,' viz. *quoad exercitium actus*, that is, they are not tied to exercise jurisdiction solely in their own persons, but may *asciscere sibi presbyteros in commune consilium*, they may 'delegate jurisdiction to the presbyters;' and that they did not so, but kept the exercise of it only in their own hands in St. Hierome's time, this is it which he saith is rather by custom than by divine dispensation, for it was otherwise at first, viz., *de facto*, and might be so still, there being no law of God against the delegation of power episcopal. As for the last words in the objection, *Et in communi debere ecclesiam regere*, it is an *assumentum* of St. Hierome's own; for all his former discourse was of the identity of names and common regiment, *de facto*, not *de jure*, and from a fact to conclude with a *deberet*, is a *non sequitur* unless this *debere* be understood according to the exigence of the former arguments, that is, 'they ought,' not by God's law, but in imitation of the practice apostolical; to wit, when things are as they were then, when the presbyters are such as

[d] Epist. [suppos.] ad Antioch. [§ 8. p. 106.]

then they were; 'they ought,' for many considerations, and in great cases, not by the necessity of a divine[e] precept.

And indeed to do him right, he so explains himself; *Et in communi debere ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet in potestate solus præesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit cum quibus populum judicaret,* 'the presbyters ought to judge in common with the bishop, for the bishops ought to imitate Moses, who might have ruled alone, yet was content to take others to him, and himself only to rule in chief.' Thus St. Hierome would have the bishops do, but then he acknowledges the right of sole jurisdiction to be in them, and therefore though his counsel perhaps might be good then, yet it is necessary at no time, and was not followed then, and to be sure is needless now. For the arguments which St. Hierome uses to prove this his intention whatever it is, I have and shall elsewhere produce, for they yield many other considerations than this collection of St. Hierome, and prove nothing less than the equality of the offices of episcopacy and presbyterate. The same thing is *per omnia* respondent to the parallel place of St. Chrysostom[f]; it is needless to repeat either the objection or answer.

But however, this saying of St. Hierome, and the parallel of St. Chrysostom, is but like an argument against an evident truth, which comes forth upon a desperate service, and they are sure to be killed by the adverse party, or to run upon their own swords; for either they are to be understood in the senses above explicated, and then they are impertinent, or else they contradict evidence of scripture and catholic antiquity, and so are false, and die within their own trenches.

I end this argument of TRADITION APOSTOLICAL with that saying of St. Hierome[g] in the same place; *Postquam unusquisque eos quos baptizabat suos putabat esse non Christi, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, Ego Apollo, Ego autem Cephæ, in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ut schismatum semina tollerentur;* that is, 'a public decree issued out in the apostles' times that in all churches one should be chosen out of the clergy, and set over them,' viz., to rule and govern the flock committed to his charge. This, I say, was in the apostles' times, even upon the occasion of the Corinthian schism; for then they said, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollo,' and then it was that 'he that baptized any catechumens took them for his own, not as Christ's disciples.' So that it was *tempore apostolorum* that this decree was made, for 'in the time of the apostles' St. James and St. Mark and St. Timothy and St. Titus were made bishops by St. Hierome's express

[e] ['divine' om. B, C.]

[f] In 1 Tim. iii. Ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον· καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν . . τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.—Homil. xi. [tom. xi. p. 604 D.]

[g] [Vid. p. 70. not. d supr.]

attestation. It was also *toto orbe decretum;* so that if it had not been proved to have been an immediate divine institution, yet it could not have gone much less, it being, as I have proved and as St. Hierome acknowledges, catholic and apostolic.

§ 22. And all this hath been the faith and practice of christendom.

"Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ," is an apostolical precept; we have seen how the apostles have followed Christ, how their TRADITION is consequent of DIVINE INSTITUTION; next let us see how the church hath followed the apostles as the apostles have followed Christ. CATHOLIC PRACTICE is the next basis of the power and order of episcopacy. And this shall be *in subsidium* to them also that call for reduction of the state episcopal to a primitive consistence, and for the confirmation of all those pious sons of holy church who have a venerable estimate of the public and authorized facts of catholic christendom.

For consider we, is it imaginable that all the world should immediately after the death of the apostles conspire together to 'seek themselves,' and not *ea quæ sunt Jesu Christi;* to erect a government of their own devising, not ordained by Christ, not delivered by His apostles, and to relinquish a divine foundation, and the apostolical superstructure, which if it was at all was a part of our Master's will, which whosoever knew and observed not was to be beaten with many stripes? Is it imaginable that those gallant men who could not be brought off from the prescriptions of gentilism to the seeming impossibilities of christianity without evidence of miracle and clarity of demonstration upon agreed principles, should all upon their first adhesion to christianity make an universal dereliction of so considerable a part of their Master's will, and leave gentilism to destroy christianity; for he that erects another economy than what the Master of the family hath ordained, destroys all those relations of mutual dependence which Christ hath made for the coadunation of all the parts of it, and so destroys it in the formality of a christian congregation or family.

Is it imaginable that all those glorious martyrs, that were so curious observers of divine sanctions and canons apostolical, that so long[h] as that ordinance of the apostles concerning abstinence from blood was of force, they would rather die than eat a strangled hen or a pudding, (for so Eusebius[i] relates of the Christians in the particular instance of Biblis[j] and Blandina,) that they would be so sedulous in contemning the government that Christ left for His family, and erect another?

To what purpose were all their watchings, their banishments, their fears, their fastings, their penances and formidable austerities, and finally their so frequent martyrdoms, of what excellency or avail, if after all they should be hurried out of this world and all their

[h] [Cf. Duct. Dubit. ii. 2. rule 2.] [i] [Hist. eccl. v. 1.] [j] [Leg. 'Bibliaa.']

fortunes and possessions by untimely, by disgraceful, by dolorous deaths, to be set before a tribunal to give account of their universal neglect and contemning of Christ's last testament, in so great an affair as the whole government of His church?

If all christendom should be guilty of so open, so united a defiance against their Master, by what argument or confidence can any misbeliever be persuaded to christianity, which in all its members for so many ages together is so unlike its first institution, as in its most public affair, and for matter of order of the most general concernment, is so contrary to the first birth?

Where are the promises of Christ's perpetual assistance, of the impregnable permanence of the church against the gates of hell, of the Spirit of truth to lead it into all truth, if she be guilty of so grand an error as to erect a throne where Christ had made all level, or appointed others to sit in it than whom He suffers. Either Christ hath left no government, or most certainly the church hath retained that government, whatsoever it is; for the contradictory to these would either make Christ improvident, or the catholic church extremely negligent (to say no worse) and incurious of her *depositum*. But upon the confidence of all christendom (if there were no more in it) I suppose we may fairly venture. *Sit anima mea cum christianis.*

§ 23. Who first distinguished names used before in common.

The first thing done in christendom upon the death of the apostles in this matter of episcopacy, is the distinguishing of names which before were common. For in holy scripture all the names of clerical offices were given to the superior order, and particularly all offices, and parts, and persons, designed in any employment of the sacred priesthood, were signified by *presbyter* and *presbyterium*. And therefore lest the confusion of names might persuade an identity and indistinction of office, the wisdom of H. Church found it necessary to distinguish and separate orders and offices by distinct and proper appellations. "For the apostles did know by our Lord Jesus Christ that contentions would arise ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, about the name of episcopacy," saith St. Clement[k]; and so it did in the church of Corinth, as soon as their apostle had expired his last breath. But so it was.

1. The apostles, which I have proved to be the supreme ordinary office in the church, and to be succeeded in, were called in scripture πρεσβύτεροι, 'elders' or 'presbyters;' πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, saith St. Peter[l] the apostle, 'the elders' or presbyters 'that are among you I also who am an elder' or presbyter 'do entreat.' Such elders St. Peter spoke to as he was himself, to wit, those to whom the regiment of the church was committed; the bishops of Asia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia; that is, to Timothy, to Tychicus, to Sosipater, to the angels of the Asian

[k] Epist. ad Corinth. [ep. i. cap. 44. p. 173.]

[l] [1 Pet. v. 1.]

churches, and all others whom himself in the next words points out by the description of their office, ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες, &c., 'feed the flock of God as bishops' (or 'being bishops') 'and overseers over it;' and that to rulers he then spake is evident by his μὴ κατακυριεύοντες, for it was impertinent to have warned them of tyranny that had no rule at all. The mere presbyters I deny not but are included in this admonition; for as their office is involved in the bishop's office, the bishop being bishop and presbyter too, so is his duty also in the bishop's; so that *pro rata* the presbyter knows what lies on him by proportion and intuition to the bishop's admonition. But again, ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, saith St. John the apostle; and ὁ πρεσβύτερος Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ· 'the presbyter to Gaius;' 'the presbyter to the elect lady.'

2. If apostles be called presbyters, no harm though bishops be called so too, for apostles and bishops are all one in ordinary office, as I have proved formerly. Thus are those apostolical men in the college at Jerusalem called presbyters, whom yet the Holy Ghost calleth ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους, 'principal men,' 'ruling men,' and οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, 'the presbyters that rule well.' By presbyters are meant bishops, to whom only according to the intention and exigence of divine institution the apostle had concredited the church of Ephesus and the neighbouring cities, *ut solus quisque episcopus præsit omnibus*, as appears in the former discourse. The same also is Acts xx., 'the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops;' and yet the same men are called πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας. The one place expounds the other, for they are both *ad idem*, and speak of elders of the same church.

3. Although bishops be called presbyters, yet even in scripture names are so distinguished that mere presbyters are never called bishops, unless it be in conjunction with bishops; and then in the general address, which in all fair deportments is made to the more eminent, sometimes presbyters are or may be comprehended. This observation, if it prove true, will clearly shew that the confusion of names of *episcopus* and *presbyter*, such as it is in scripture, is of no pretence by any intimation of scripture for the indistinction of offices; for even the names in scripture itself are so distinguished that a mere presbyter alone is never called a bishop, but a bishop and apostle is often called a presbyter, as in the instances above.

But we will consider those places of scripture which use to be pretended in those impertinent arguings from the identity of name to confusion of things, and shew that they neither interfere upon the main question, nor this observation.

"Paul and Timotheus to all the saints which are in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons[m]." I am

[m] [Phil. i. 1.]

willinger to choose this instance, because the place is of much consideration in the whole question, and I shall take this occasion to clear it from prejudice and disadvantage.

"By bishops are here meant presbyters, because many bishops in a church could not be, and yet St. Paul speaks plurally of the bishops of the church of Philippi, and therefore must mean mere presbyters." So it is pretended.

1. First then, by 'bishops' are, or may be, meant the whole superior order of the clergy, 'bishops and priests;' and that he speaks plurally, he may, besides the bishops in the church, comprehend under their name the presbyters too; for why may not the name be comprehended as well as the office and order, the inferior under the superior, the lesser within the greater; for since the order of presbyters is involved in the bishops' order, and is not only inclusively in it but derivative from it, the same name may comprehend both persons, because it does comprehend the distinct offices and orders of them both. And in this sense it is, if it be at all, that presbyters are sometimes in scripture called bishops.

2. Why may not 'bishops' be understood properly? for there is no necessity of admitting that there were any mere presbyters at all at the first founding of this church; it can neither be proved from scripture nor antiquity, if it were denied. For indeed a bishop, or a company of episcopal men, as there were at Antioch, might do all that presbyters could, and much more; and considering that there are some necessities of a church which a presbyter cannot supply and a bishop can, it is more imaginable that there was no presbyter than that there was no bishop: and certainly it is most unlikely that what is not expressed, to wit, presbyters, should be only meant, and that which is expressed should not be at all intended.

3. 'With the bishops' may be understood in the proper sense, and yet no more bishops in one diocese than one, of a fixed residence. For in that sense is St. Chrysostom[n] and the fathers to be understood in their commentaries on this place, affirming that "one church could have but one bishop;" but then take this along, that it was not then unusual in such great churches to have many men who were temporary residentiaries, but of an apostolical and episcopal authority, as in the churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch there was, as I have proved in the premises: nay, in Philippi itself, if I mistake not, an instance may be given full and home to this purpose; *Salutant te episcopi Onesimus, Vitus, Damas, Polybius, et omnes qui sunt Philippis in Christo, unde et hæc vobis scripsi*, saith Ignatius, in his epistle to Hero[o] his deacon. So that many bishops we see might be at Philippi, and many were actually there long after St. Paul's dictate of the epistle.

4. Why may not 'bishops' be meant in the proper sense? Because

[n] Τί τοῦτο; μίας πόλεως πολλοὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν; οὐδαμῶς.—Chrysost. in Phil. i. [ver. 1. tom. xi. p. 195 A.]

[o] [§ 8.—Inter spur. p. 111.]

there could not be more bishops than one in a diocese. No? by what law? if by a constitution of the church after the apostles' times, that hinders not but it might be otherwise in the apostles' times; if by a law in the apostles' times, then we have obtained the main question by the shift, and the apostles did ordain that there should be one and but one bishop in a church, although it is evident they appointed many presbyters: and then let this objection be admitted how it will, and do its worst, we are safe enough.

5. 'With the bishops' may be taken distributively; for Philippi was a metropolis, and had divers bishoprics under it; and St. Paul, writing to the church of Philippi, wrote also to all the daughter-churches within its circuit, and therefore might well salute many bishops though writing to one metropolis; and this is the more probable if the reading of this place be accepted according to Œcumenius[p]; for he reads it not σὺν ἐπισκόποις but συνεπισκόποις, *coepiscopis et diaconis*, 'Paul and Timothy to the saints at Philippi, and to our fellow-bishops.'

6. St. Ambrose[q] refers this clause of *cum episcopis et diaconis* to St. Paul and St. Timothy, intimating that the benediction and salutation was sent to the saints at Philippi, from 'St. Paul and St. Timothy with the bishops and deacons;' so that the reading must be thus, 'Paul and Timothy with the bishops and deacons, to all the saints at Philippi,' &c. *Cum episcopis et diaconis, hoc est, cum Paulo et Timotheo, qui utique episcopi erant, simul et significavit diaconos qui ministrabant ei; ad plebem enim scribit: nam si episcopis scriberet et diaconis, ad personas eorum scriberet, et loci ipsius episcopo scribendum erat, non duobus vel tribus, sicut et ad Titum et Timotheum.*

7. The like expression to this is in the epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians[r], which may give another light to this; speaking of the apostles, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, 'they delivered[s] their first fruits to the bishops and deacons.' 'Bishops' here indeed may be taken distributively, and so will not infer that many bishops were collectively in any one church; but yet this gives intimation for another exposition of this clause to the Philippians. For here either presbyters are meant by διακόνους, 'ministers;' or else presbyters are not taken care of in the ecclesiastical provision, which no man imagines, of what interest soever he be; it follows then that 'bishops and deacons' are no more but *majores* and *minores sacerdotes* in both places; for as *presbyter* and *episcopus* were confounded, so also *presbyter* and *diaconus;* and I think it will easily be shewn in scripture that the word *diaconus* is given oftener to apostles and bishops and presbyters,

[p] [Rather, to S. Chrysostom. The passage in Œcumenius is not decisive, but that of St. Chrysostom from which it is taken, is so.]

[q] In Phil. i. [tom. ii. append. col. 251.]

[r] [Ep. i. cap. 42. p. 171.]

[s] ['Prædicantes per regiones ac urbes, primitias earum . . in episcopos et diaconos . . constituerunt.' Coteler.]

than to those ministers which now by way of appropriation we call deacons. But of this anon. Now again to the main observation.

Thus also it was in the church of Ephesus; for St. Paul, writing to their bishop, and giving order for the constitution and deportment of the church orders and officers, gives directions first for bishops, then for deacons. Where are the presbyters in the *interim?* Either they must be comprehended in bishops or in deacons: they may as well be in one as the other, for *diaconus* is not in scripture any more appropriated to the inferior clergy than *episcopus* to the superior; nor so much neither, for *episcopus* was never used in the New testament for any but such as had the care, regiment, and supravision of a church, but *diaconus* was used generally for all ministers[t].

But yet supposing that presbyters were included under the word *episcopus*, yet it is not because the offices and orders are one, but because that the order of a presbyter is comprehended within the dignity of a bishop. And then indeed the compellation is of the more principal, and the presbyter is also comprehended for his conjunction and involution in the superior, which was the principal observation here intended; *nam in episcopo*[u] *omnes ordines sunt, quia primus sacerdos est, hoc est, princeps est sacerdotum, et propheta et evangelista, et cætera adimplenda officia ecclesiæ in ministerio fidelium*, saith St. Ambrose[v]; so that if in the description of the qualifications of a bishop he intends to qualify presbyters also, then it is principally intended for a bishop, and of the presbyters only by way of subordination and comprehension. This only by the way, because this place is also abused to other issues; to be sure it is but a vain dream that because presbyter is not named, that therefore it is all one with a bishop, when as it may be comprehended under bishop as a part in the whole or the inferior within the superior, the office of a bishop having in it the office of a presbyter and something more: or else it may be as well intended in the word 'deacons;' and rather than the word 'bishop:' first, because 'bishop' is spoken of in the singular number, 'deacons' in the plural, and so liker to comprehend the multitude of presbyters: secondly, presbyters, or else bishops, and therefore much more presbyters, are called by St. Paul, διάκονοι, 'ministers;' 'deacons' is the word; διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύετε, 'deacons by whose ministration ye believed:' and thirdly, by the same argument deacons may be as well one with the bishop too: for in the epistle to Titus St. Paul describes the office of a bishop, and says not a word more either of presbyter or deacon's office; and why, I pray, may not the office of presbyters in the epistle to Timothy be omitted as well as presbyters and deacons

[t] ['ministries,' B, C.]

[u] ['in Christo,' nonnulli MSS.]

[v] In Ephes. iv. [ver. 12.—tom. ii. append. col. 241 D.]—Idem ait S. Dionysius, Eccles. hierarch. cap. v. [p. 122 D.] Ἡ δὲ τῆς ἱεραρχικῆς τάξεως δύναμις ἐν πάσαις χωρεῖ ταῖς ἱεραῖς ὁλότησιν (i. e. τάξεσιν), καὶ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τάξεων ἐνεργεῖ τὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἱεραρχίας μυστήρια.

too in that to Titus? or else why may not deacons be confounded and be all one with bishop, as well as presbyter? It will, it must be so, if this argument were any thing else but an airy and impertinent nothing.

After all this, yet it cannot be shewn in scripture that any one single and mere presbyter is called a bishop; but it may be often found that a bishop, nay, an apostle, is called a presbyter, as in the instances above; and therefore since this communication of names is only in descension, by reason of the involution, or comprehension of presbyter within *episcopus*, but never in ascension; that is, an apostle, or a bishop, is often called presbyter, and deacon, and prophet, and pastor, and doctor, but never *retro*, that a mere deacon or a mere presbyter should be called either bishop or apostle; it can never be brought either to depress the order of bishops below their throne, or erect mere presbyters above their stalls in the quire. For we may as well confound apostle and deacon, and with clearer probability, than *episcopus* and *presbyter*. For apostles and bishops are in scripture often called deacons[w]; I gave one instance of this before, but there are very many: *εἰς διακονίαν ταύτην*[x], was said of St. Matthias when he succeeded Judas in the apostolate; *καλὸς ἔσῃ διάκονος*[y], saith St. Paul to Timothy bishop of Ephesus; St. Paul is called *διάκονος τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*[z], 'a deacon of the new testament;' and *διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε*[a] is said of the first founders of the Corinthian church, 'deacons by whom ye believed.' Paul and Apollos were the men. It is the observation of St. Chrysostom[b], *καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐλέγετο· διὰ τοῦτο γράφων καὶ Τιμοθέῳ ἔλεγε, Τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι·* 'and a bishop was called a deacon; wherefore writing to Timothy he saith to him, being a bishop, Fulfil thy deaconship.'

Add to this that there is no word or designation of any clerical office but is given to bishops and apostles.—The apostles are called 'prophets,' Acts xiii.; the "prophets at Antioch" were Lucius and Manaen, and Paul and Barnabas.—And then they are called 'pastors' too; and indeed *hoc ipso* that they are bishops, they are pastors; *Spiritus S. posuit vos episcopos pascere ecclesiam Dei:* whereupon the Greek scholiast expounds the word *pastor* to signify bishops, *τοὺς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐμπεπιστευμένους λέγει, οἷος ὁ Τιμόθεος, οἷος ὁ Τίτος ἦν·* and ever since that St. Peter set us a copy in the compellation of the Prototype, calling Him the great 'Shepherd and Bishop of our souls,' it hath obtained in all antiquity that 'pastors' and 'bishops' are coincident, and we shall very hardly meet with an instance to the contrary.—If bishops be pastors, then they are doctors

[w] [2 Cor. vi. 4.]
[x] [Acts i. 25.]
[y] [1 Tim. iv. 6.]
[z] [2 Cor. iii. 6.]
[a] [1 Cor. iii. 5.]
[b] In Phil. i. [hom. i. tom. xi. p. 195.]

also, for these are conjunct when other offices which may in person be united yet in themselves are made disparate; for "God hath given some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers[c]," ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους· if pastors, then also doctors and teachers. And this is observed by St. Austin[d], "Pastors and doctors whom you would have me to distinguish, I think are one and the same; for Paul doth not say, 'some pastors, some doctors,' but to pastors he joineth doctors, that pastors might understand it belongeth to their office to teach." The same also is affirmed by Sedulius[e] upon this place.

Thus it was in scripture; but after the churches were settled and bishops fixed upon their several sees, then the names also were made distinct, only those names which did design temporary offices did expire; τότε γὰρ τέως ἐκοινώνουν ὀνόματι, saith St. Chrysostom[f], 'thus far the names were common,' viz., in the sense above explicated, λοιπὸν δὲ τὸ ἰδίαζον ἑκάστῳ ἀπονενέμηται ὄνομα, ἐπισκόπου ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέρου πρεσβυτέρῳ[g]· 'but immediately the names were made proper and distinct, and to every order its own name is left, of a bishop to a bishop, of a presbyter to a presbyter.' This could not be supposed at first; for when they were to borrow words from the titles of secular honour or offices, and to transplant them to an artificial and imposed sense, use, which is the master of language, must rule us in this affair, and use is not contracted but in some process and descent of time. For at first christendom itself wanted a name, and the disciples of the glorious Nazarene were christened first in Antioch, for they had their baptism some years before they had their name. It had been no wonder then if *per omnia* it had so happened in the compellation of all the offices and orders of the church.

§ 24. Appropriating the word *episcopus* or bishop to the supreme church officer.

But immediately after the apostles, and still more in descending ages, *episcopus* signified only the superintendent of the church, the 'bishop' in the present and vulgar conception. Some few examples I shall give instead of myriads.

In the canons of the apostles the word ἐπίσκοπος or 'bishop' is used thirty-six times in appropriation to him that is the ordinary ruler and president of the church above the clergy and the laity, being twenty-four times expressly distinguished from 'presbyter,' and in the other fourteen having particular care for government, jurisdiction, censures, and ordinations committed to him, as I shall shew hereafter; and all this is within the verge of the first fifty, which are received as authentic, by the council of Nice[h]; of An-

[c] [Eph. iv. 11.]
[d] Epist. lix. ad Paulinum. [Ben. cxlix. tom. ii. col. 507 G.]
[e] [Scil. Sedul. Hibern., p. 505 D.]
[f] [Ubi supra, not. b.]
[g] [. . ὄνομα, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος, edd.]
[h] Can. xv. and xvi. [tom. i. col. 329.]

tioch[i], twenty-five canons whereof are taken out of the canons of the apostles; the council of Gangra[k] calling them *canones ecclesiasticos*, and *apostolicas traditiones;* by the epistle of the first council of Constantinople to Damasus[l], which Theodoret[m] hath inserted into his story; by the council of Ephesus[n]; by Tertullian[o]; by Constantine the great[p]; and are sometimes, by way of eminency, called 'the canons,' sometimes 'the ecclesiastical canons;' sometimes 'the ancient and received canons of our fathers;' sometimes 'the apostolical canons,' *τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων δεχθέντας καὶ κυρωθέντας, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ παραδοθέντας ἡμῖν ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἀποστόλων*, said the fathers of the council *in Trullo*[q]; and Damascene[r] puts them in order next to the canon of holy scripture; so in fact does Isidore in his preface to the work of the councils[s], for he sets these canons in front, because *sancti patres eorum sententias synodali auctoritate roboraverunt, et inter canonicas posuerunt constitutiones*, 'the holy fathers have established these canons by the authority of councils, and have put them amongst the canonical constitutions.' And great reason: for in pope Stephen's time[t] they were translated into Latin by one Dionysius at the entreaty of Laurentius, because then the old Latin copies were rude and barbarous; now then this second translation of them being made in pope Stephen's time who was contemporary with St. Irenæus and St. Cyprian, the old copy, elder than this, and yet after the original to be sure, shews them to be of prime antiquity; and they are mentioned by St. Stephen[u] in an epistle of his to bishop Hilarius, where he is severe in censure of them who do prevaricate these canons.—But for further satisfaction I refer the reader to the epistle of Gregory Haloander to the moderators of the city of Norimberg. I deny not but they are called apocryphal by Gratian and some others, viz., in the sense of the church, just as the Wisdom of Solomon, or Ecclesiasticus, but yet by most believed to be written by St. Clement from the dictate of the apostles, and without all question are so far canonical as to be of undoubted ecclesiastical authority and of the first antiquity.

Ignatius's[x] testimony is next in time and in authority. *Ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων τύπος ὑπάρχει*, 'the bishop bears the image and representment of the Father of all.' And a little after, *τί γάρ*

[i] Can. ix. et alibi. [tom. i. col. 595.]
[k] [Can. xx. tom. i. col. 537 sq.]
[l] [It speaks of *παλαιὸς θεσμὸς*, i. e. (say Beveridge and others) the apostolical canon.]
[m] [Hist. eccl. v. 9.]
[n] Post advent. episc. Cypri. [Harduin. tom. i. col. 1620.—*Ψῆφος . . συνόδου.* The document here referred to is given in some MSS. as canon viii. of the Council. See Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 104, and Zonaras' note upon the canon.]
[o] Adv. Praxeam [? De jejun. adv. psych. cap. 14, et De præscript. adv. hæret. cap. 12.—Vid. Bevereg. de Canonn. apostol. § 8.]
[p] Vit. Const. [lib. iii. cap. 59.]
[q] [Can. ii. tom. iii. col. 1660.]
[r] De orthod. fid. [lib. iv. cap. 17. fin. p. 284 C.]
[s] [Harduin., tom. i. col. 4 D.]
[t] Anno Dom. 257.
[u] [Harduin., tom. i. col. 142 A.]
[x] Ep. [interpol.] ad Trall. [§ 3, 7.—pp. 61, 3.]

ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων κρατῶν; . . τί δὲ πρεσβυτέριον ἀλλ' ἢ σύστημα ἱερὸν, σύμβουλοι καὶ συνέδρευται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου; τί δὲ διάκονοι, κ.τ.λ. 'what is the bishop but he that hath all authority and rule? what is the presbytery but a sacred college, counsellors and helpers or assessors to the bishop? what are deacons,' &c. So that here is the real and exact distinction of dignity, the appropriation of name and intimation of office: the bishop is above all; the presbyters, his helpers; the deacons, his ministers, μιμηταὶ τῶν ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων, 'imitators of the angels, who are ministering spirits.' But this is of so known, so evident a truth, that it were but impertinent to insist longer upon it. Himself in three of his epistles uses it nine times in distinct enumeration, viz., to the Trallians, to the Philadelphians, to the Philippians.

And now I shall insert these considerations.

1. Although it was so that *episcopus* and *presbyter* were distinct in the beginning after the apostles' death, yet sometimes the names are used promiscuously; which is an evidence that confusion of names is no intimation, much less an argument, for the parity of offices, since themselves who sometimes, though indeed very seldom, confound the names, yet distinguish the offices frequently, and dogmatically. Μηδὲν ἄνευ τῶν ἐπισκόπων πράττε· ἱερεῖς γάρ εἰσι, σὺ δὲ διάκονος τῶν ἱερέων[y]· where by ἐπισκόπων he means the presbyters of the church of Antioch; so indeed some say, and though there be no necessity of admitting this meaning, because by ἐπισκόπων he may mean the suffragan bishops of Syria, yet the other may be fairly admitted; for himself their bishop was absent from his church, and had delegated to the presbytery episcopal jurisdiction to rule the church till he being dead another bishop should be chosen, so that they were *episcopi vicarii*, and by representment of the person of the bishop, and execution of the bishop's power by delegation, were called ἐπίσκοποι· and this was done lest the church should not be only without a father, but without a guardian too; and yet what a bishop was, and of what authority, no man more confident and frequent than Ignatius. Another example of this is in Eusebius[z], speaking of the youth whom St. John had converted and commended to a bishop. Clemens, whose story this was, proceeding in the relation, says, ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος, κ.τ.λ. 'but the presbyter;' unless by πρεσβύτερος here St. Clement means not the order, but age, of the man; as it is like enough he did, for a little after he calls him, ὁ πρεσβύτης, 'the old man;' *tum vero presbyter in domum suam suscipit adolescentem; Redde depositum, O episcope,* saith St. John to him; *tunc graviter suspirans senior, &c.;* so St. Clement. But this, as it is very unusual, so it is just as in scripture, viz., in descent and comprehension, for this bishop also was a presbyter as well as bishop; or else in the delegation of episcopal power, for so it is in the allegation of Ignatius.

[y] Epist. [supposit.] ad Heron. [§ 3. p. 109.] [z] [Vid. p. 30, not. l. supr.]

2. That this name *episcopus* or 'bishop' was chosen to be appropriate to the supreme order of the clergy, was done with fair reason and design; for this is no fastuous or pompous title, the word is of no dignity, and implies none but what is consequent to the just and fair execution of its offices: but *presbyter* is a name of dignity and veneration; "Rise up to the grey head;" and it transplants the honour and reverence of age to the office of the presbyterate; and yet this the bishops left, and took that which signifies a mere supravision and overlooking of his charge; so that if we take estimate from the names, *presbyter* is a name of dignity, and *episcopus* of office and burden. "He that desires the office of a bishop, desires a good work," προστασίας γὰρ ἔργον ἐστὶ, saith St. Chrysostom[a]. *Nec dicitur, Si quis episcopatum desiderat bonum desiderat gradum, sed, bonum opus desiderat, quod in majori ordine constitutus possit, si velit, occasionem exercendarum habere virtutum,* so St. Hierome[b]; 'It is not an honourable title, but a good office, and a great opportunity of the exercise of excellent virtues.' But for this we need no better testimony than of St. Isidore[c], *Episcopatus autem vocabulum inde ductum, quod ille qui superefficitur superintendat, curam scilicet subditorum gerens.* But *presbyter græce latine senior interpretatur, non pro ætate vel decrepita senectute, sed propter honorem et dignitatem quam acceperunt.* Οὐδέν ἐστι πρεσβύτερον, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδέν ἐστι τιμιώτερον· καὶ πρεσβεύειν τὸ τιμᾷν, παρὰ Πλάτωνι, saith Julius Pollux[d].

3. Supposing that *episcopus* and *presbyter* had been often confounded in scripture and antiquity, and that both in ascension and descension, yet as priests may be called angels, and yet the bishop be the angel of the church, 'the angel,' for his excellency; 'of the church,' for his appropriate pre-eminence and singularity: so, though presbyters had been called bishops in scripture, (of which there is not one example but in the senses above explicated, to wit, in conjunction and comprehension;) yet the bishop is ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, by way of eminence, 'the bishop:' and in descent of time it came to pass that the compellation which was always his by way of eminence, was made his by appropriation. And a fair precedent of it we have from the compellation given to our blessed Saviour, ὁ μέγας ποίμην καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ψυχῶν, 'the great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls.' The name 'bishop' was made sacred by being the appellative of His person, and by fair intimation it does more immediately descend upon them who had from Christ more immediate mission and more ample power, and therefore *episcopus* and *pastor* by way of eminence are the most fit appellatives for them who in the church have the greatest power, office, and dignity, as participating of the fulness of

[a] [In 1 Tim. hom. x. tom. xi. p. 598 E.]

[b] [Adv. Jovinian., lib. i. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 176.]

[c] Etymol., lib. vii. cap. 12. [§ 11. tom. iii. p. 341.]

[d] [Vid. lib. ii. cap. 2. segm. 12. tom. i. p. 158.]

that power and authority for which Christ was called 'the Bishop of our souls.' And besides this so fair a copy; besides the using of the word in the prophecy of the apostolate of Matthias, and in the prophet Isaiah, and often in scripture, as I have shewn before; any one whereof is abundantly enough for the fixing an appellative upon a church officer; this name may also be intimated as a distinctive compellation of a bishop over a priest, because ἐπισκοπεῖν is indeed often used for the office of bishops, as in the instances above, but σκοπεῖν is used for the office of the inferiors; for St. Paul[e] writing to the Romans, who then had no bishop fixed in the chair of Rome, does command them σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας ποιοῦντας· σκοπεῖν, not ἐπισκοπεῖν, this for the bishop, that for the subordinate clergy. So then the word *episcopus* is fixed at first, and that by derivation, and example of scripture, and fair congruity of reason.

§ 25. Calling the bishop, and him only, the pastor of the church.

But the church used other appellatives for bishops which it is very requisite to specify, that we may understand divers authorities of the fathers, using those words in appropriation to bishops which of late have been given to presbyters, ever since they have begun to set presbyters in the room of bishops.

And first, bishops were called 'pastors' in antiquity, in imitation of their being called so in scripture. Eusebius[f], writing the story of St. Ignatius, *Denique cum Smyrnam venisset ubi Polycarpus erat, scribit inde unam epistolam ad Ephesios eorumque pastorem*, that is, Onesimus; for so follows, *in qua meminit Onesimi.* Now that Onesimus was their bishop, himself[g] witnesses in the epistle here mentioned, τὴν πολυπάθειαν ὑμῶν ἐν ὀνόματι Θεοῦ ἀπείληφα ἐν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ ἐπ' ἀγάπῃ ἀδιηγητῷ, ὑμῶν δὲ ἐπισκόπῳ, κ.τ.λ. Onesimus was their bishop, and therefore their pastor; and in his epistle *ad Antiochenos*[h] himself makes mention of Evodius, τοῦ ἀξιομακαριστου ποιμένος ὑμῶν, 'your most blessed[i] and worthy pastor.'

When Paulus Samosatenus[j] first broached his heresy against the divinity of our blessed Saviour, presently a council was called, where St. Denis bishop of Alexandria could not be present, *Cæteri vero ecclesiarum pastores diversis e locis et urbibus . . conveniunt Antiochiam; in quibus insignes et cæteris præcellentes erant Firmilianus a Cæsarea Cappadociæ, Gregorius et Athenodorus fratres, . . et Helenus Sardensis ecclesiæ episcopus, . . sed et Maximus Bostrensis episcopus dignus eorum consortio cohærebat.* These bishops, Firmilianus and Helenus and Maximus, were the pastors; and not only so, but presbyters were not called pastors, for he proceeds, *sed et presbyteri quamplurimi et diaconi ad supradictam urbem . . convenerunt.* So that these were

[e] [Rom. xvi. 17.]
[f] Hist. eccl. iii. 36. [Ruffin. p. 68.]
[g] Epist. ad Ephes. [interpol. et ver. § 1. pp. 44 et 12.]
[h] [§ 7. p. 106.]
[i] [A like mistake in rendering is made p. 101, (see note h) infra.]
[j] Euseb., vii. 24. [Ruffin. p. 171.]

not under the general appellative of pastors. And the council of Sardis[k] making provision for the manner of election of a bishop to a widow church, when the people is urgent for the speedy institution of a bishop, if any of the comprovincials be wanting, he must be certified by the primate ὅτι ἀξιοῖ τὰ πλήθη ποιμένα αυτοῖς δοθῆναι, 'that the multitude require a pastor to be given unto them.' The same expression is also in the epistle[l] of Julius bishop of Rome to the presbyters, deacons, and people of Alexandria, in behalf of their bishop Athanasius; *Suscipite siquidem, . . fratres carissimi, cum omni divina gratia pastorem vestrum ac præsulem tanquam vere ἀθανάσιον.* And a little after, *et gaudete fruentes orationibus, qui pastorem vestrum . . esuritis et sititis, &c.* The same is often used in St. Hilary and St. Gregory Nazianzen[m], where bishops are called *pastores magni*, 'great shepherds' or 'pastors.' When Eusebius the bishop of Samosata was banished, *universi lachrymis prosecuti sunt ereptionem pastoris sui*, saith Theodoret[n], 'they wept for the loss of their pastor.' And Eulogius[o] a presbyter of Edessa, when he was arguing with the prefect in behalf of christianity, *Et pastorem (inquit) habemus, et nutus illius sequimur*, 'we have a pastor,' (a bishop certainly, for himself was a priest,) 'and his commands we follow.' But I need not specify any more particular instances; I touched upon it before. He that shall consider that to bishops the regiment of the whole church was concredited at the first, and the presbyters were but his assistants in cities and villages, and were admitted *in partem sollicitudinis*, first casually and cursorily, and then by station and fixed residency when parishes were divided and endowed, will easily see that this word *pastor* must needs be appropriated to bishops, to whom, according to the conjunctive expression of St. Peter and the practice of infant christendom, ἐπισκοπεῖν and ποιμαίνειν was intrusted, first solely, then in communication with others, but always principally.

But now of late, especially in those places where the bishops are exauctorated, and no where else that I know, but amongst those men that have complying designs, the word 'pastor' is given to parish priests, against the manner and usage of ancient christendom: and though priests may be called pastors in a limited, subordinate sense, and by way of participation (just as they may be called angels when the bishop is the angel, and so pastors when the bishop is the pastor, and so they are called *pastores ovium* in St. Cyprian[p]) but never are they called *pastores* simply or *pastores ecclesiæ* for above six hundred years in the church, and I think eight hundred more. And therefore it was good counsel which St. Paul gave, to avoid *vocum novitates*,

[k] Can vi. [tom. i. col. 641.]
[l] [Cassiod.] hist. tripart., lib. iv. cap. 29. [p. 255.]
[m] [Passim, vid. indic.]
[n] Lib. iv. cap. 14. [al. 13. tom. iii. p. 970.]
[o] Theodoret, lib. iv. cap. 18. [al. 15. tom. iii. p. 977.]
[p] Epist. xi. [al. xv. p. 34.]

because there is never any affectation of new words contrary to the ancient voice of christendom, but there is some design in the thing too to make an innovation; and of this we have had long warning, in the new use of the word 'pastor.'

§ 26. And doctor. If bishops were the 'pastors,' then 'doctors' also; it was the observation which St. Augustine[q] made out of Ephes. iv., as I quoted him even now, "For God hath given some apostles, some prophets, . . some pastors and doctors." So the church hath learned to speak. In the Greeks' council of Carthage it was decreed that places which never had a bishop of their own should not now have καθηγητὴν ἴδιον, 'a doctor of their own,' that is, a bishop, but still be subject to the bishop of the diocese to whom formerly they gave obedience; and the title of the chapter is, that the parts of the diocese without the bishop's consent ἐπίσκοπον ἕτερον μὴ δέχεσθαι, 'must not have another bishop;' he who in the title is called 'bishop,' in the chapter is called the 'doctor.' And thus also Epiphanius[r] speaking of bishops calleth them πατέρας καὶ διδασκάλους, 'fathers and doctors;' *gratia*[s] *enim ecclesiæ laus doctoris est*, saith St. Ambrose[t], speaking of the eminence of the bishop over the presbyters and subordinate clergy. The same also is to be seen in St. Austin[u], Sedulius[u], and divers others. I deny not but it is in this appellative as in divers of the rest, that the presbyters may in subordination be also called doctors; for every presbyter must be διδακτικὸς, 'apt to teach[v];' but yet this is expressed as a requisite in the particular office of a bishop, and no where expressly of a presbyter, that I can find in scripture; but yet because in all churches it was by license of the bishop that presbyters did preach, if at all, and in some churches the bishop only did it, particularly of Alexandria, (μόνος ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος διδάσκει, saith Sozomen[x],) therefore it was that the presbyter in the language of the church was not, but the bishop was often, called doctor of the church.

§ 27. And pontifex. The next word which the primitive church did use as proper to express the offices and eminence of bishops is *pontifex* and *pontificatus* for episcopacy. *Sed a Domino edocti consequentiam rerum, episcopis pontificatus*[a] *munera assignavimus*, said the apostles, as St. Clement[b] reports. *Pontificale* πέταλον St. John the apostle wore in his forehead as an ensign of his apostleship, a gold plate or medal, when he was *in pontificalibus* 'in his pontifical or apostolical habit,' saith Eusebius[c]. *De dispensati-*

[q] [Vid. p. 89. not. d. supr.]
[r] Hær. lxxv. [§ 4. p. 908 A.]
[s] [al. 'grata.']
[t] [De off. min. lib. ii. cap. 24. tom. ii. col. 98 F.]
[u] [Vid. p. 89, nott. d, e, supr.]
[v] [1 Tim. iii. 2.]
[x] Lib. vii. [cap. 19.]
[a] [ἀρχιερωσύνης, Gr.]
[b] Const. apost., lib. viii. cap. ult. [fol. 156 b.]
[c] [Hist. eccl. iii. 31.]

onibus . . ecclesiarum antiqua . . sanctio tenuit, et definitio sanctorum patrum in Nicæa convenientium . . et si pontifices voluerint, ut cum eis vicini propter utilitatem celebrent ordinationes, said the fathers of the council of Constantinople[d]. *Qua tempestate in urbe Roma Clemens quoque, tertius post Paulum et Petrum, pontificatum tenebat,* saith Eusebius according to the translation of Ruffinus[e]. *Apud Antiochiam vero Theophilus per idem tempus sextus ab apostolis ecclesiæ pontificatum tenebat,* saith the same Eusebius[f]. And there is a famous story[g] of Alexander bishop of Cappadocia, that when Narcissus bishop of Jerusalem was invalid and unfit for government by reason of his extreme age, he was designed by a particular revelation and a voice from heaven; *Suscipite episcopum qui vobis a Deo destinatus est,* 'receive your bishop whom God hath appointed for you;' but it was when Narcissus *jam senio fessus pontificatus ministerio sufficere non posset,* saith the story. Eulogius[h] the confessor discoursing with the prefect that wished him to comply with the emperor, asked him, *Numquid ille una cum imperio etiam pontificatum est consequutus,* 'he hath an empire, but hath he also a bishopric?' *Pontificatus*[i] is the word. But St. Dionysius[j] is very exact in the distinction of clerical offices, and particularly gives this account of the present, *Est igitur pontificatus ordo qui perficiente vi præditus munera hierarchiæ, quæ perficiunt &c.;* and a little after, *Sacerdotum autem ordo . . subjectus pontificum ordini, &c.* To which agrees St. Isidore, in his Etymologies[k], *Ideo autem et presbyteri sacerdotes vocantur, quia sacrum dant sicut et episcopi, qui licet sint sacerdotes, tamen pontificatus apicem non habent, quia nec chrismate frontem signant, nec Paracletum spiritum dant, quod solis deberi episcopis lectio Actuum apostolorum demonstrat;* and in the same chapter[l], *pontifex princeps sacerdotum est.*

And *sacerdos ecclesiæ.*

One word more there is often used in antiquity for bishops, and that's *sacerdos. Sacerdotum autem bipartitus est ordo,* say St. Clement and Anacletus[m], for they are *majores* and *minores;* the *majores* bishops, the *minores* presbyters; for so it is in the apostolical constitutions attributed to St. Clement[n], *Episcopis quidem assignavimus et attribuimus quæ ad principatum sacerdotii pertinent, presbyteris vero quæ ad sacerdotium;* and in St. Cyprian[o], *Presbyteri cum episcopis sacerdotali honore conjuncti.* But although in such distinction and subordination, and in concretion, a presbyter is sometimes called *sacerdos,* yet in antiquity *sacerdotium ecclesiæ* does evermore signify episcopacy, and *sacerdos ecclesiæ*

[d] [Cassiod.] hist. tripart., lib. ix. cap. 14. [p. 336.]
[e] [Lib. iii. cap. 21. p. 59.]
[f] Hist. eccl. iv. 20. [Ruffin. p. 90.]
[g] [Ibid., lib. vi. cap. 9. p. 137.]
[h] [Theodoret. iv. 18.]
[i] [ἱερωσύνη, Gr.]
[j] Eccles. hierarch. [cap. v. p. 123 B. Ἔστιν οὖν ἡ ἱεραρχικὴ τάξις, ἡ τῆς τελειωτικῆς δυνάμεως ἀναπεπλησμένη, τὰ τελεσιουργὰ τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἐκκρίτως τελετουργοῦσα, κ.τ.λ.]
[k] Lib. vii. cap. 12. [§ 21. tom. iii. p. 342.]
[l] [§ 13. p. 341.]
[m] [Ep. iii. § 1. p. 157.]
[n] Lib. viii. cap. 46. [fol. 156 b.]
[o] Lib. iii. ep. 1. [al. ep. lxi. p. 145.]

the bishop, (*Theotecnus sacerdotium ecclesiæ tenens in episcopatu*, saith Eusebius[p],) and *summus sacerdos*, the bishop always; *dandi baptismum jus habet summus sacerdos qui est episcopus*, saith Tertullian[q]: and indeed *sacerdos* alone is very seldom used in any respect but for the bishop, unless when there is some distinctive term and of higher report given to the bishop at the same time.

Ecclesia est plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori grex suo adhærens, saith St. Cyprian[r]. And that we may know by *sacerdos* he means the bishop, his next words are, *unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo*. And in the same epistle, *qui ad Cyprianum episcopum literas de carcere direxerunt*[s], *sacerdotem Dei agnoscentes, et contestantes ei*. Eusebius[t] reckoning some of the chief bishops assembled in the council of Antioch, *in quibus erant... Helenus Sardensis ecclesiæ episcopus, et Nicomas ab Iconio, et Hierosolymorum præcipuus sacerdos Hymenæus, et vicinæ huic urbi Cæsareæ Theotecnus*; and in the same place the bishops of Pontus are called *Ponti provinciæ sacerdotes*. *Abilius apud Alexandriam tredecim annis sacerdotio ministrato diem obit*, for so long he was bishop; *cui succedit Cerdon tertius in sacerdotium*. *Et Papias similiter apud Hierapolim sacerdotium gerens*, for he was bishop of Hierapolis, saith Eusebius[u]: and the bishops of the province of Arles[x], speaking of their first bishop Trophimus, ordained bishop by St. Peter, say, *quod prima inter Gallias Arelatensis civitas missum a beatissimo Petro apostolo sanctum Trophimum habere meruit sacerdotem*. The bishop also was ever designed when *antistes ecclesiæ* was the word; *Melito quoque Sardensis antistes ecclesiæ*, saith Eusebius[y] out of Irenæus; προεστὼς is the name in Greek, and used for the bishop by Justin Martyr[z], and is of the same authority and use with *prælatus* and *præpositus ecclesiæ*. *Antistes sacerdos dictus, ab eo quod ante stat; primus est enim in ordine ecclesiæ, et supra se nullum habet*, saith St. Isidore[a].

But in those things which are of no question I need not insist. One title more I must specify, to prevent misprision upon a mistake of theirs of a place in St. Ambrose[b]. The bishop is sometimes called *primus presbyter*. *Nam et Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat; quia primi presbyteri episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo sequens ei succederet*. Elections were made of bishops out of the college of presbyters; *Presbyteri unum ex se electum episcopum nominabant*, saith St. Hierome[c], but at first this election was

[p] Hist. eccl. vii. 28. [Ruffino interpr., p. 179.]
[q] De baptismo. [cap. xvii. p. 230 C.]
[r] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 168.]
[s] [al. 'dixerunt.']
[t] [Hist. eccl. vii. 24. Ruffino interpr., p. 171.]
[u] [ibid., capp. xxi. xxxv. pp. 59, 68.]
[x] Epist. com. provinc. ad S. Leonem [Concil. Reg., tom. vii. p. 267.]
[y] [Hist. eccl. iv. 26. Ruffino interpr., p. 93.]
[z] [Apol. i. § 67. p. 83 D.]
[a] [Etymol., lib. vii. cap. 12. § 16. tom. iii. p. 341.]
[b] In Eph. iv. [ver. 12. tom. ii. append. col. 241 F.]
[c] [Ad Evang., tom. iv. part. 2. col. 803.]

made not according to merit but according to seniority, and therefore bishops were called *primi presbyteri*; that's St. Ambrose his sense. But St. Austin[d] gives another; *primi presbyteri*, that is, 'chief above the presbyters.' *Quid est episcopus nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos*, saith he. And St. Ambrose[e] himself gives a better exposition of his words than is intimated in that clause before, *Episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est; uterque enim sacerdos est, sed episcopus primus est, ut omnis episcopus presbyter sit, non . . omnis presbyter episcopus; hic enim episcopus est qui inter presbyteros primus est.* The bishop is *primus presbyter*, that is, *primus sacerdos, hoc est, princeps est sacerdotum*, so he expounds it[f]; not *princeps* or *primus inter presbyteros*, himself remaining a mere presbyter, but *princeps presbyterorum*; for *primus presbyter* could not be *episcopus* in another sense, he is the chief, not the senior of the presbyters. Nay, *princeps presbyterorum* is used in a sense lower than *episcopus*; for Theodoret speaking of St. John Chrysostom saith that "having been the first presbyter at Antioch, yet refused to be made bishop for a long time;" *Johannes enim qui diutissime princeps fuit presbyterorum Antiochiæ ac sæpe electus præsul, perpetuus vitator dignitatis illius, de hoc admirabili solo pullulavit.*

The church also in her first language when she spake of *præpositus ecclesiæ* meant the bishop of the diocese. Of this there are innumerable examples, but most plentifully in St. Cyprian[g] in his iii. iv. vii. xi. xiii. xv. xxiii. and xxvii. epistles, and in Tertullian his book *ad Martyras*[h], and infinite places more. Of which this advantage is to be made, that the primitive church did generally understand those places of scripture which speak of 'prelates' or *præpositi* to be meant of 'bishops;' *obedite præpositis*, saith Paul[i], 'obey your prelates,' or 'them that are set over you.' *Præpositi autem pastores sunt*, saith St. Austin[k], 'prelates are they that are pastors.' But St. Cyprian[l] sums up many of them together, and insinuates the several relations expressed in the several compellations of bishops. For writing against Florentius Pupianus, *Ac nisi*, saith he, *apud te purgati fuerimus, . . ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit episcopum, nec plebs præpositum, nec grex pastorem, nec ecclesia gubernatorem, nec Christus antistitem, nec Deus sacerdotem;* and all this he means of himself, who had then been 'six years bishop' of Carthage, 'a prelate of the people, a governor to the church, a pastor to the flock, a priest of the most high God, a minister of Christ.'

[d] Quæst. vet. et nov. test. qu. ci. [tom. iii. part. 2. append. col. 93 A.]

[e] [In 1 Tim. iii. 10. tom. ii. append. col. 295 A.]

[f] In Ephes. iv. [ver. 11. tom. ii. append. col. 241 D.]

[g] [al. viii. ix. xiii. xv. xix. xx. xxvii. xxxiii.—pp. 16, 19, 28, 34, 42, 43, 52, 66.]

[h] [p. 136 sqq.—But it does not contain the word *præpositus* as applied to a bishop.]

[i] [Heb. xiii. 17.]

[k] [Serm. xlvi. cap. 1, et xlvii. cap. 1. tom. v. coll. 226 A, 248 G.]

[l] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 167.]

The sum is this; when we find in antiquity any thing asserted of any order of the hierarchy under the names of *episcopus*, or *princeps sacerdotum*, or *presbyterorum primus*, or *pastor*, or *doctor*, or *pontifex*, or *major* or *primus sacerdos*, or *sacerdotium ecclesiæ habens*, or *antistes ecclesiæ*, or *ecclesiæ sacerdos*, unless there be a specification and limiting of it to a parochial and inferior minister it must be understood of bishops in its present acceptation; for these words are all by way of eminency, and most of them by absolute appropriation and singularity, the appellations and distinctive names of bishops.

§ 28. And these were a distinct order from the rest.

But ὀνόματα τῶν πραγμάτων μιμήματα, saith the philosopher[m], and this their distinction of names did amongst the fathers of the primitive church denote a distinction of calling and office supereminent to the rest.—For first, bishops are by all antiquity reckoned as a distinct office of clergy. *Si quis presbyter, aut diaconus, aut quilibet de numero clericorum . . pergat ad alienam parochiam . . præter episcopi sui conscientiam, &c.;* so it is in the fifteenth canon of the apostles[n], and so it is there plainly distinguished as an office different from presbyter and deacon above thirty times in those canons, and distinct powers given to the bishop which are not given to the other, and to the bishop above the other. The council of Ancyra[o] inflicting censures upon presbyters first, then deacons, which had fallen in time of persecution, gives leave to the bishop to mitigate the pains as he sees cause; *Sed si ex episcopis aliqui in iis vel afflictionem aliquam . . viderint, in eorum potestate id esse:* the canon would not suppose any bishops to fall, for indeed they seldom did; but for the rest provision was made, both for their penances, and indulgence at the discretion of the bishop. And yet sometimes they did fall; Optatus[p] bewails it, but withal gives evidence of their distinction of order; *Quid commemorem laicos qui tunc in ecclesia nulla fuerant dignitate suffulti? quid ministros plurimos, quid diaconos in tertio, quid presbyteros in secundo sacerdotio constitutos? Ipsi apices et principes omnium, aliqui episcopi . . instrumenta divinæ legis impie tradiderunt;* 'the laity, the ministers, the deacons, the presbyters, nay the bishops themselves, the princes and chief of all, proved traditors.' The diversity of order is here fairly intimated, but dogmatically affirmed by him in his second book *Adv. Parmen.*[q] *Quatuor genera capitum sunt in ecclesia, episcoporum, presbyterorum, diaconorum, et fidelium;* 'there are four sorts of heads in the church, bishops, presbyters, deacons, and the faithful laity.' And it was remarkable that when the people of Hippo had as it were by violence carried St. Austin to be made priest by their bishop Valerius, some seeing the good man

[m] [Arist. Rhet. iii. 1. § 8.]
[n] [Coteler. Patr. apostol., tom. i. p. 444.]
[o] can. i. and ii. [tom. i. col. 271.]
[p] Ad Parmen., lib. i. [cap. 13. p. 13.]
[q] [cap. 24. p. 46.]

weep in consideration of the great hazard and difficulty accruing to him in his ordination to such an office, thought he had wept because he was not bishop; they pretending comfort, told him, *quia locus presbyterii, licet ipse majore dignus esset, appropinquaret tamen episcopatui,* 'the office of a presbyter, though indeed he deserved a greater, yet was the next step in order to a bishopric,' so Posidonius[r] tells the story; it was the next step, the next in descent, in subordination, the next under it. So the council of Chalcedon[s], ἐπίσκοπον εἰς πρεσβυτέρου βαθμὸν φέρειν ἱεροσυλία ἐστὶν, 'it is sacrilege to bring down a bishop to the degree and order of a presbyter;' ἀπὸ τῆς πράξεως ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποκινεῖν, so the council permits in case of great delinquency, 'to suspend him from the execution of his episcopal order,' but still the character remains, and the degree of itself is higher.

Nos autem idcirco hæc scribimus (fratres cariss.) quia novimus quam sacrosanctum debeat esse episcopale sacerdotium, quod et clero et plebi esse debet exemplo, said the fathers of the council of Antioch in Eusebius[t]; 'the office of a bishop is sacred, and exemplary both to the clergy and the people.' *Interdixit per omnia magna synodus, non episcopo, non presbytero, non diacono licere*[u], *&c.* And it was a remarkable story[v] that Arius troubled the church for missing of a prelation to the order and dignity of a bishop; *post Achillam enim Alexander ordinatur episcopus, hoc autem tempore Arius in ordine presbyterorum fuit,* 'Alexander was ordained a bishop, and Arius still left in the order of mere presbyters.' Of the same exigence are all those clauses of commemoration of a bishop and presbyters of the same church. *Julius autem Romanus episcopus propter senectutem defuit, erantque pro eo præsentes Vitus et Vincentius presbyteri ejusdem ecclesiæ,* 'they were his vicars, and deputies for their bishop in the Nicene council,' saith Sozomen[x]. But most pertinent is that of the Indian persecution, related by the same man[y]. Many of them were put to death, *erant autem horum alii quidem episcopi, alii presbyteri, alii diversorum ordinum clerici.* And this difference of order is clear in the epistle of the bishops of Illyricum to the bishops of the Levant[z], *De episcopis autem constituendis vel comministris jam constitutis, si permanserint usque ad finem sani, bene; . . similiter presbyteros atque diaconos in sacerdotali ordine definivimus, &c.* And of Sabbatius[a] it is said, *Nolens in suo ordine manere presbyteratus, desiderabat episcopatum,* 'he would not stay in the order of a presbyter, but desired a bishopric.' *Ordo episcoporum quadripertitus est, in patriarchis, archiepiscopis, metropolitis, atque episcopis,* saith St. Isi-

[r] [Seu 'Possidius.'] De vita August., cap. iv. [col. 260.]
[s] can. xxix. [tom. ii. col. 613.]
[t] lib. vii. cap. 26. [Ruffino interpr., p. 176.]
[u] Nicene Council, can. iii. [tom. i. col. 323.]
[v] [Cassiod. hist. tripart., i. 12.]
[x] [Apud Cassiod.] hist. tripart., lib. ii. cap. 1. [p. 224.]
[y] [Ibid.,] lib. iii. cap. 2. [p. 236.]
[z] [Ibid., lib. vii. cap. 10. p. 306.]
[a] [Cassiod. post Socratem.] hist. tripart., lib. xi. cap. 5. [p. 367.]

dore[b], *omnes autem superius designati ordines uno eodemque vocabulo episcopi nominantur.* But it were infinite to reckon authorities, and clauses of exclusion for the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons; we cannot almost dip in any tome of the councils but we shall find it recorded; and all the martyr bishops of Rome did ever acknowledge and publish it that episcopacy is a peculiar office and order in the church of God; as is to be seen in their decretal epistles in the first tome of the councils[c].—I only sum this up with the attestation of the church of England in the preface to the book of ordination, "It is evident to all men diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church, bishops, priests, and deacons," the same thing exactly that was said in the second council of Carthage[d], *τρεῖς βαθμοὺς τούτους, φημὶ δὲ, ἐπισκόπους, πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ διακόνους.*

But we shall see it better, and by more real probation; for that bishops were a distinct order appears by this:—

§ 29. To which the presbyterate was but a degree.

1. The presbyterate was but a step to episcopacy, as deaconship to the presbyterate; and therefore the council of Sardis[e] decreed that no man should be ordained bishop but he that was first a reader, and a deacon, and a presbyter, *ἵνα καθ' ἕκαστον βαθμὸν . . εἰς τὴν ἀψῖδα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κατὰ προκοπὴν διαβῆναι δυνηθείη,* 'that by every degree he may pass to the sublimity of episcopacy.' *Ἔξει δὲ ἕκάστου τάγματος ὁ βαθμὸς οὐκ ἐλαχίστου δηλονότι χρόνου μῆκος, κ.τ.λ.,* 'but the degree of every order must have the permanence and trial of no small time.' Here there is clearly a distinction of orders, and ordinations and assumptions to them respectively, all of the same distance and consideration; and Theodoret[f], out of the synodical epistle of the same council, says that they complained that some from Arianism were reconciled, and promoted from deacons to be presbyters, from presbyters to be bishops, calling it *μείζονα βαθμὸν,* 'a greater degree' or 'order;' and St. Gregory Nazianz. in his Encomium of St. Athanasius[g], speaking of his canonical ordination and election to a bishopric, says that he was chosen being *ἀξιάγαστος,* 'most worthy[h],' and *πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν βαθμῶν ἀκολουθίαν διεξελθὼν,* 'coming through all the inferior orders.' The same commendation St. Cyprian[i] gives of Cornelius; *Non iste ad episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum sæpe promeritus, ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit, . . et factus est episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris qui tunc in urbe Roma*

[b] Etymol., lib. vii. cap. 12. [§ 4, 8. tom. iii. p. 340.]
[c] Per Binium Paris.
[d] can. ii. [tom. i. col. 951.]
[e] can. x. [tom. i. col. 643.]
[f] [lib. ii. cap. 8.]
[g] [Orat. xxi. § 7. tom. i. p. 389 D.]
[h] ['Αξιάγαστος, ἀξιοθαύμαστος. Zonaras; vide Steph.—Cf. p. 93, not. i. supra.]
[i] Epist. lii. [al. lv. p. 103 sq.]

aderant, qui ad nos literas . . de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Here is evident not only a promotion but a new ordination of St. Cornelius to be bishop of Rome; so that "now the chair is full," saith St. Cyprian, *et quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit foris fiat necesse est, nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, &c.*; 'no man else can receive ordination to the bishopric.'

§ 30. There being a peculiar manner of ordination to a bishopric.

2. The ordination of a bishop to his chair was done *de novo*, after his being a presbyter; and not only so, but in another manner than he had when he was made priest. This is evident in the first ecclesiastical canon that was made after scripture[k], Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν· πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω, καὶ διάκονος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοὶ, 'a priest and deacon must be ordained of one bishop, but a bishop must be ordained by two or three at least.' And that we may see it yet more to be apostolical, St. Anacletus in his second epistle[l] reports, *Hierosolymitarum primus archiepiscopus B. Jacobus a Petro, Jacobo, et Johanne apostolis est ordinatus*; three apostles went to the ordaining of St. James to be a bishop; and the self-same thing is in words affirmed by Anicetus[m], *ut in ore duorum vel trium stet omnis veritas*; and St. Cyprian[n] observes that when Cornelius was made bishop of Rome, there happened to be many of his fellow-bishops there, *et factus est episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant.* These *collegæ* could not be mere priests, for then the ordination of Novatus had been more canonical than that of Cornelius, and all christendom had been deceived; for not Novatus, who was ordained by three bishops, but Cornelius had been the schismatic, as being ordained by priests against the canon. But here I observe it for the word *plurimis*, there were 'many' of them at that ordination.

In pursuance of this apostolical ordinance the Nicene fathers decreed[o] that a bishop should be ordained ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ[p], 'by all the bishops in the province,' unless it be in case of necessity; and then it must be done by three being gathered together, and the rest consenting; so the ordination to be performed. The same is ratified in the council of Antioch[q], Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας, 'a bishop is not to be ordained without a synod of bishops and the presence of the metropolitan of the province;' but if this cannot be done conveniently, yet however it is required μετὰ τῆς τῶν πλειόνων παρουσίας ἢ ψήφου γίνεσθαι τὴν κατάστασιν, 'the ordinations must be performed by many.' The same was decreed in the council of

[k] [Can. apost. i. et ii.]
[l] [p. 147.]
[m] Epist. unica. [§ 1. p. 237.]
[n] [Vid. pag. præced. not. i.]
[o] can. iv. [tom. i. col. 323.]
[p] [ἐπαρχίᾳ, ed.]
[q] can. xix. [tom. i. col. 599.]

Laodicea, can. xii.[r], in the thirteenth canon of the African code[s], in the twenty-second canon of the first council of Arles[t], and the fifth canon of the second council of Arles[u], and was ever the practice of the church; and so we may see it descend through the bowels of the fourth council of Carthage[x] to the inferior ages, *Episcopus quum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt manibus suis caput ejus tangant.*

The thing was catholic and canonical; it was *prima et immutabilis constitutio,* so the first canon of the council of Epaunum[y] calls it. And therefore after the death of Meletius bishop of Antioch a schism was made about his successor, and Evagrius his ordination condemned[z] because *præter ecclesiasticam regulam fuerit ordinatus,* 'it was against the rule of holy church;' why so? *Solus enim Paulinus eum instituerat, plurimas regulas prævaricatus ecclesiasticas; non enim præcipiunt ut pro se quilibet ordinare possit, sed convocare universos provinciæ sacerdotes, et præter tres pontifices ordinationem fieri penitus interdicunt;* which because it was not observed in the ordination of Evagrius, who was not ordained by three bishops, the ordination was cassated in the council of Rhegium[a]. And we read that when Novatus would fain be made a bishop in the schism against Cornelius, he did it *tribus adhibitis episcopis,* saith Eusebius[b]; he 'obtained three bishops' for performance of the action.

Now besides these apostolical and catholic canons and precedents, this thing, according to the constant and united interpretation of the Greek fathers, was actually done in the ordination of St. Timothy to the bishopric of Ephesus; "Neglect not the grace that is in thee by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery[c]." The Latin fathers expound it abstractly, viz., to signify the office of priesthood, that is, 'neglect not the grace of priesthood, that is in thee by the imposition of hands;' and this Erasmus[d] helps, by making *presbyterii* to pertain to *gratiam,* by a new interpunction of the words; but however, *presbyterii* with the Latin fathers signifies *presbyteratus,* not *presbyterorum;* and this *presbyteratus* is in their sense used for *episcopatus* too: but the Greek fathers understand it collectively, and πρεσβυτερίον is put for πρεσβυτέρων, not simply such, but bishops too. All agree in that, that episcopacy is either meant in office, or in person. Πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐπισκόπους φησὶν, so Œcumenius[e]; and St. Chrysostom[f], οὐ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων φησὶν ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλὰ περὶ

[r] [tom. i. col. 783.]
[s] [ibid., col. 871.]
[t] [al. can. xx. ibid., col. 266.]
[u] [tom. ii. col. 773.]
[x] [can. ii. tom. ii. col. 979.]
[y] A.D. 509. [al. 517. tom. ii. col. 1048.]
[z] Theodoret. [apud Cassiod.] lib. ix. cap. 44. [p. 350.]
[a] [Legend. fors. 'Regium.'—Concil. Regense, can. ii. tom. i. col. 1749.]
[b] [Hist. eccl. vi. 33. Ruffino interpr., p. 156.]
[c] [1 Tim. iv. 14.]
[d] [Erasmus (ad loc.) mentions but does not accept this interpretation.—tom. vi. col. 938 F.]
[e] [In 1 Tim. iv. 14. p. 755.]
[f] [In eund. loc. tom. xi. p. 618 B.]

ἐπισκόπων. So Theophylact; so Theodoret. The probation of this lies upon right reason and catholic tradition; for,

§ 81. To which presbyters never did assist by imposing hands.

3. The bishop's ordination was peculiar in this respect above the presbyter's, for a presbyter did never impose hands on a bishop: on a presbyter they did, ever since the fourth council of Carthage; but never on a bishop. And that was the reason of the former exposition. By the 'presbytery' St. Paul means 'bishops,' οὐ γὰρ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐχειροτόνησαν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, 'presbyters did not impose hands on a bishop,' and therefore *presbyterium* is not a college of mere presbyters, for such could never ordain St. Timothy to be a bishop. The same reason is given by the Latin fathers, why they expound *presbyterium* to signify episcopacy. For, saith St. Ambrose[g], St. Paul had ordained Timothy to be a bishop; *Unde et quemadmodum episcopum ordinet, ostendit; neque enim fas erat aut licebat ut inferior ordinaret majorem;* so he; and subjoins this reason, *nemo n. tribuit quod non accepit.* The same is affirmed by St. Chrysostom[h], and generally by the authors of the former expositions, that is, the fathers both of the east and west. For it was so general and catholic a truth that priests could not, might not, lay hands on a bishop, that there was never any example of it in christendom till almost six hundred years after Christ, and that but once, and that irregular, and that without imitation in[i] his successors, or example in his antecessors. It was the case of pope Pelagius the first[j]; *et dum non essent episcopi qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo episcopi Johannes de Perusio et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas presbyter de Ostia, et ordinaverunt eum pontificem; tunc enim non erant in clero qui eum possent promovere,* saith Damasus[k]; it was in case of necessity; because there were not three bishops, therefore he procured two, and a priest of Ostia to supply the place of the third, that three, according to the direction apostolical, and canons of Nice, Antioch, and Carthage, make episcopal ordination. The church of Rome is concerned in the business to make fair this ordination, and to reconcile it to the council of Rhegium[l], and the others before mentioned who if asked would declare it to be invalid. But certainly as the canons did command three to impose hands on a bishop, so also they commanded that those three should be three bishops; and Pelagius might as well not have had three, as not three bishops; and

[g] [In 1 Tim. iii. 8. tom. ii. append. col. 295 A.]

[h] [In 1 Tim. iv. 14. hom. xiii. tom. xi. p. 618 B.]

[i] ['of,' B, C.]

[j] A.D. *555.*

[k] In libro pontificali. [al. 'Anastasius in Vitis Pontificum,' (vid. Ciaconium et Fabricium in Damaso,) cap. lxi. p. 59. 4to. Mogunt. 1602.] Vit. Pelag. i. ['Dum non esset episcopus qui eum ordinaret, inventi sunt duo episcopi, Joannes de Perusia, et Bonus de Florentino (al. Ferentino), et Andreas presbyter de Hostia (al. Ostia), et ordinaverunt eum pontificem; tunc non erant in clero qui poterant eum promovere.']

[l] [vid. not. a. supr.]

better, because so they were bishops, the first canon of the apostles approves the ordination if done by two, ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν· and the Nicene canon is as much exact in requiring the capacity of the person as the number of the ordainers. But let them answer it. For my part, I believe that the imposition of hands by Andreas was no more in that case than if a layman had done it; it was χεὶρ ἄκυρος[m], and though the ordination was absolutely uncanonical, yet it being in the exigence of necessity, and being done by two bishops according to the apostolical canon, it was valid *in natura rei*, though not *in forma canonis*, and the addition of the priest was but to cheat the canon, and cozen himself into an impertinent belief of a canonical ordination: ἐπίσκοποι . . ἐπισκόπους καθιστᾷν ὀφείλουσιν, saith the council of Sardis[n], 'bishops must ordain bishops;' it was never heard that priests did or *de jure* might.

These premises do most certainly infer a real difference between episcopacy and the presbyterate; but whether or no they infer a difference of order or only of degree, or whether degree and order be all one or no, is of great consideration in the present and in relation to many other questions.

1. First then, it is evident that in antiquity *ordo* and *gradus* were used promiscuously; βαθμὸς was the Greek word, and for it the Latins used *ordo*, as is evident in the instances above mentioned. To which add that Anacletus[o] says that Christ did *instituere duos ordines, episcoporum et sacerdotum;* and St. Leo[p] affirms, *primum ordinem esse episcopalem, secundum presbyteralem, tertium Leviticum.* And these among the Greeks are called τρεῖς βαθμοί, 'three degrees;' so the order of deaconship in St. Paul is called καλὸς βαθμὸς, 'a good degree;' and βαθμοῦ ἐκπίπτειν, &c. is a censure used alike in the censures of bishops, priests, and deacons. They are all of the same name, and the same consideration, for order, distance, and degree, amongst the fathers; *gradus* and *ordo* are equally affirmed of them all, and the word *gradus* is used sometimes for that which is called *ordo* most frequently. So Felix[q] writing to St. Austin, *Non tantum ego possum contra tuam virtutem, quia mira virtus est gradus episcopalis;* and St. Cyprian[r] of Cornelius, *Ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit.* Degree and order are used in common; for he that speaks most properly will call that an order in persons, which corresponds to a degree in qualities; and neither of the words are wronged by a mutual substitution.

2. The promotion of a bishop *ad munus episcopale* was at first

[m] [vid. p. 113 infra.]

[n] [can. vi. tom. i. col. 641.]

[o] ['Sacerdotum . . ordo bipartitus est, sicut Dominus illum constituit.—Episcopi . . apostolorum, presbyteri . . septuaginta duorum discipulorum locum tenent.']—Ep. iii. [§ 1. p. 157.]

[p] [vid.] Epist. lxxxiv. cap. 4. [p. 154.]

[q] [S. Aug.] De actis cum Felice Manich., lib. ii. cap. 12. [tom. viii. col. 478 B.]

[r] lib. iv. epist. 2. [al. ep. lv. p. 103.]

called *ordinatio episcopi*. "Stir up the grace that is in thee," *juxta ordinationem tuam in episcopatum*, saith Sedulius[s]; and St. Hierome[t], *Prophetiæ gratiam habebat cum ordinatione episcopatus.—Neque enim fas erat aut licebat ut inferior ordinaret majorem*, saith St. Ambrose[u], proving that presbyters might not impose hands on a bishop. *Romanorum ecclesia Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit*[v], saith Tertullian[x]; and St. Hierome[y] affirms that St. James was ordained bishop of Jerusalem immediately after the passion of our Lord. *Ordinatus* was the word at first, and afterwards *consecratus* came in conjunction with it; when Moses the monk was to be ordained, to wit a bishop (for that's the title of the story in Theodoret[z]) and spied that Lucius was there ready to impose hands on him, *Absit*, says he, *ut manus tua me consecret.*

3. In all orders there is the impress of a distinct character; that is, the person is qualified with a new capacity to do certain offices which before his ordination he had no power to do. A deacon hath an order or power,

> ——— quo pocula vitæ
> Misceat, et latices cum sanguine porrigat agni,

as Arator[a], himself a deacon, expresses it: a presbyter hath a higher order or degree in the office or ministry of the church, whereby he is enabled προσφέρειν, ὁμιλεῖν, καὶ λειτουργεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν, as the council of Ancyra[b] does intimate: but a bishop hath a higher yet, for besides all the offices communicated to priests and deacons he can give orders, which very one thing makes episcopacy to be a distinct order. For *ordo* is defined by the schools to be *traditio potestatis spiritualis et collatio gratiæ ad obeunda ministeria ecclesiastica*, 'a giving a spiritual power and a conferring grace for the performance of ecclesiastical ministrations.' Since then episcopacy hath a new ordination and a distinct power, as I shall shew in the descent, it must needs be a distinct order, both according to the name given it by antiquity, and according to the nature of the thing in the definitions of the school.

There is nothing said against this but a fancy of some of the church of Rome, obtruded indeed upon no grounds; for they would define order to be "a special power in relation to the holy sacrament," which they call *corpus Christi naturale*; and episcopacy indeed to be a distinct power in relation *ad corpus Christi mysticum*, or the regiment of the church and ordaining labourers for the harvest, and therefore not to be a distinct order.

[s] [Sedul. Hibern. in 2 Tim. i. 6. p. 518.]
[t] [In 1 Tim. iv. 14. tom. v. col. 1091.]
[u] [In 1 Tim. iii. 8. tom. ii. append. col. 295 A.]
[v] [leg. 'refert.']
[x] De præscript., cap. xxxii. [p. 213.]
[y] [Script. eccles. in Jacobo, tom. iv. part. 2. col. 101.]
[z] lib. iv. cap. 23. [al. 20. tom. iii. p. 1000.]
[a] [lib. i. p. 248.]
[b] can. i. [tom. i. col. 271.]

But this, to them that consider things sadly, is true or false according as any man list. For if these men are resolved they will call nothing an order but what is a power in order to the consecration of the eucharist, who can help it? Then indeed in that sense episcopacy is not a distinct order; that is, a bishop hath no new power in the consecration of the venerable eucharist, more than a presbyter hath. But then why these men should only call this power 'an order,' no man can give a reason. For first, in antiquity the distinct power of a bishop was ever called an order, and I think before Hugo de S. Victore and the Master of the Sentences no man ever denied it to be an order. Secondly, according to this rate, I would fain know how the office of a sub-deacon, and of an ostiary, and of an acolouthite, and of a reader, come to be distinct orders; for surely the bishop hath as much power in order to consecration *de novo* as they have *de integro;* and if I mistake not, that the bishop hath a new power to ordain presbyters who shall have a power of consecrating the eucharist, is more a new power in order to consecration than all those inferior officers put together have in all; and yet they call them orders, and therefore why not episcopacy also, I cannot imagine, unless because they will not.

But however, in the mean time, the denying the office and degree of episcopacy to be a new and distinct order is an innovation, of the production of some in the church of Rome, without all reason and against all antiquity. This only by the way.

The enemies of episcopacy call in aid from all places for support of their ruinous cause, and therefore take their main hopes from the church of Rome by advantage of the former discourse. For since, say they, that consecration of the sacrament is the greatest work[c], of the most secret mystery, greatest power, and highest dignity, that is competent to man, and this a presbyter hath as well as a bishop, is it likely that a bishop should by divine institution be so much superior to a presbyter, who by the confession of all sides communicates with a bishop in that which is his highest power; and shall issues of a lesser dignity distinguish the orders, and make a bishop higher to a presbyter, and not rather the greater raise up a presbyter to the counterpoise of a bishop? Upon this surmise the men of the church of Rome would infer an identity of order, though a disparity of degree, but the men of the other world would infer a parity both of order and degree too. The first are already answered in the premises; the second must now be served.

1. First then, whether power be greater, of ordaining priests, or consecrating the sacrament, is an impertinent question; possibly it may be of some danger; because in comparing God's ordinances there must certainly be a depression of one, and whether that lights upon

[c] S. Hieron. ad Rusticum Narbonens. apud Gratian. dist. xcv. cap. 'Ecce ego.' Casus, ibid. [col. 498.]

the right side or no, yet peradventure it will not stand with the consequence of our gratitude to God to do that which in God's estimate may tant'amount to a direct undervaluing; but however, it is unprofitable, of no use in case of conscience either in order to faith or manners, and besides, cannot fix itself upon any basis, there being no way of proving either to be more excellent than the other.

2. The sacraments and mysteries of christianity if compared among themselves, are greater and lesser in several respects. For since they are all in order to several ends, that is, productive of several effects, and they all are excellent, every rite and sacrament in respect of its own effect is more excellent than the other not ordained to that effect. For example; matrimony is ordained for a means to preserve chastity, and to represent the mystical union of Christ and His church, and therefore in these respects is greater than baptism, which does neither; but baptism is for 'remission of sins[d],' and in that is more excellent than matrimony. The same may be said for ordination and consecration, the one being in order to Christ's natural body, as the schools speak, the other in order to His mystical body, and so have their several excellencies respectively; but for an absolute pre-eminence of one above the other, I said there was no basis to fix that upon, and I believe all men will find it so that please to try; but in a relative or respective excellency they go both before and after one another. Thus wool and a jewel are better than each other; for wool is better for warmth, and a jewel for ornament. A frog hath more sense in it than the sun, and yet the sun shines brighter.

3. Suppose consecration of the eucharist were greater than ordaining priests, yet that cannot hinder but that the power of ordaining may make a higher and distinct order; because the power of ordaining hath in it the power of consecrating and something more; it is all that which makes the priest, and it is something more besides which makes the bishop. Indeed if the bishop had it not and the priest had it, then supposing consecration to be greater than ordination the priest would not only equal but excel the bishop; but because the bishop hath that and ordination besides, therefore he is higher both in order and dignity.

4. Suppose that consecration were the greatest clerical power in the world, and that the bishop and the priest were equal in the greatest power, yet a lesser power than it superadded to the bishop's may make a distinct order and superiority. Thus it was said of the Son of man[e], *Constituit eum paulo minorem angelis*, 'He was made a little lower than the angels.' It was but a little lower, and yet so much as to distinguish their natures, for "He took not upon Him the nature of angels, but . . the seed of Abraham." So it is in proportion between bishop and priest; for though a priest communicating in the greatest power of the church, viz., consecration of the

[d] The Nicene Creed. [e] [Heb. ii. 7, 16.]

venerable eucharist, yet differing in a less, is *paulo minor angelis*, 'a little lower than' the bishop, 'the angel' of the church; yet this 'little lower' makes a distinct order, and enough for a subordination. An angel and a man communicate in those great excellencies of spiritual essence; they both discourse; they have both election and freedom of choice; they have will, and understanding, and memory, impresses of the divine image, and locomotion, and immortality. And these excellencies are, being precisely considered, of more real and eternal worth than the angelical manner of moving so in an instant, and those other forms and modalities of their knowledge and volition; and yet for these superadded parts of excellency the difference is no less than specifical. If we compare a bishop and a priest thus, what we call difference in nature there will be a difference in order here, and of the same consideration.

5. Lastly it is considerable, that these men that make this objection do not make it because they think it true, but because it will serve a present turn. For all the world sees that to them that deny the real presence this can be no objection, and most certainly the anti-episcopal men do so in all senses; and then what excellency is there in the power of consecration more than in ordination? Nay, is there any such thing as consecration at all? This also would be considered from their principles. But I proceed.

One thing only more is objected against the main question. If episcopacy be a distinct order, why may not a man be a bishop that never was a priest, as (abstracting from the laws of the church) a man may be a presbyter that never was a deacon; for if it be the impress of a distinct character, it may be imprinted *per saltum*, and independently, as it is in the order of a presbyter.

To this I answer, it is true, if the powers and characters themselves were independent; as it is in all those offices of human constitution which are called the inferior orders; for the office of an acolouthite, of an exorcist, of an ostiary, are no way dependent on the office of a deacon, and therefore a man may be deacon that never was in any of those; and perhaps a presbyter too that never was a deacon, as it was in the first example of the presbyterate in the seventy-two disciples. But a bishop though he have a distinct character, yet it is not disparate from that of a presbyter, but supposes it *ex vi ordinis*. For since the power of ordination (if any thing be) is the distinct capacity of a bishop, this power supposes a power of consecrating the eucharist to be in the bishop; for how else can he ordain a presbyter with a power that himself hath not? can he give what himself hath not received?

I end this point with the saying of Epiphanius[f], *Vox est Aerii hæretici, Unus est ordo episcoporum et presbyterorum, una dignitas*, 'to say that bishops are not a distinct order from presbyters was a

[f] Hær. lxxv. [§ 3. p. 906 D.]

heresy first broached by Aërius;' and hath lately been (at least in the manner of speaking) countenanced by many of the church of Rome.

§ 32. For bishops had a power distinct and superior to that of presbyters. As of ordination.

For to clear the distinction of order, it is evident in antiquity that bishops had a power of imposing hands for collating of orders, which presbyters have not. What was done in this affair in the times of the apostles, I have already explicated; but now the enquiry is what the church did in pursuance of the practice and tradition apostolical. The first and second canons of the apostles command that two or three bishops should ordain a bishop, and one bishop should ordain a priest and a deacon; a presbyter is not authorized to ordain, a bishop is. St. Dionysius[g] affirms, *Sacerdotem non posse initiari nisi per invocationes episcopales*, and acknowledges no ordainer but a bishop. No more did the church ever; insomuch that when Novatus, the father of the old Puritans, did *ambire episcopatum*, he was fain to go to the utmost parts of Italy, and seduce or entreat some bishops to impose hands on him, as Cornelius witnesses in his epistle to Fabianus[h], in Eusebius[i]. To this we may add, as so many witnesses, all those ordinations made by the bishops of Rome, mentioned in the pontifical book of Damasus[k], Platina, and others. *Habitis de more sacris ordinibus Decembri mense, presbyteros decem, diaconos duos, &c., creat S. Clemens. Anacletus presbyteros quinque, diaconos tres, episcopos diversis in locis sex numero creavit;* and so in descent for all the bishops of that succession for many ages together.

But let us see how this power of ordination went in the bishop's hand alone, by law and constitution; for particular examples are infinite.

In the council of Ancyra[l] it is determined, χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν· ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ· 'that rural bishops shall not ordain presbyters or deacons in another's diocese without letters of license from the bishop; neither shall the priests of the city attempt it.'—First, not rural bishops, that is, bishops that are taken *in adjutorium episcopi principalis*, 'vicars to the bishop of the diocese,' they must not ordain priests and deacons; for it is ἑτέρα παροικία, it is 'another's diocese,' and to be ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος is prohibited by the canon of scripture. But then they may with license? yes, for they had episcopal ordination at first, but not episcopal jurisdiction, and so were not to invade the territories of their neighbour. The tenth canon of

[g] Eccles. hier., cap. v. [vid. p. 126.]
[h] [al. 'Fabius.']
[i] lib. vi. c. 33. [al. 43.]
[k] [al. 'Anastasius,' vid. p. 104. not. k. supra.]
[l] can. xiii. [tom. i. col. 275.]

the council of Antioch clears this part. The words are these, as they are rendered by Dionysius Exiguus[m], *Qui in villis et vicis constituti sunt chorepiscopi, tametsi manus impositionem ab episcopis susceperunt, [et ut episcopi sunt consecrati] tamen oportet eos modum proprium retinere, &c.;* εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες. The next clause, *et ut episcopi consecrati sunt,* although it be in very ancient Latin copies, yet is not found in the Greek, but is an *assumentum* for exposition of the Greek, but is most certainly implied in it; for else what description could this be of *chorepiscopi,* above *presbyteri rurales,* to say that they were χειροθεσίαν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, for so had country priests, they had received imposition of the bishop's hands. Either then the *chorepiscopi* had received ordination from three bishops, and ἐπισκόπων is to be taken collectively not distributively, to wit, that each country bishop had received ordination from 'bishops;' many bishops in conjunction, and so they were very bishops; or else they had no more than village priests, and then this caution had been impertinent.—But the city priests were also included in this prohibition. True it is, but it is in a parenthesis, with an ἀλλὰ μηδὲ, in the midst of the canon; and there was some particular reason for the involving them; not that they ever did actually ordain any, but that since it was prohibited to the *chorepiscopi* to ordain (to them I say, who though for want of jurisdiction they might not ordain without license, it being *in aliena parochia,* yet they had capacity by their order to do it) if these should do it, the city presbyters, who were often despatched into the villages upon the same employment by a temporary mission that the *chorepiscopi* were by an ordinary and fixed residence, might perhaps think that their commission might extend further than it did; or that they might go beyond it, as well as the *chorepiscopi;* and therefore their way was obstructed by this clause of ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως. Add to this, the presbyters of the city were of great honour and peculiar privilege, as appears in the thirteenth canon of the council of Neo-Cæsarea[n], and therefore might easily exceed if the canon had not been their bridle.

The sum of the canon is this. With the bishop's license the *chorepiscopi* might ordain, for themselves had episcopal ordination; but without license they might not, for they had but delegate and subordinate jurisdiction, and therefore in the fourteenth canon of Neo-Cæsarea[n] are said to be εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα, 'like the seventy disciples,' that is, inferior to bishops; and the seventy were to the twelve apostles, viz., *in hoc particulari,* not in order, but like them in subordination and inferiority of jurisdiction. But the city presbyters might not ordain, neither with nor without license; for they are in the canon only by way of parenthesis, and the sequence of procuring a faculty from the bishops to collate orders is to be re-

[m] [Rather, by Isidorus Mercator.—Dionysius' rendering is somewhat different.—See both in Harduin. Concil. tom. i. col. 597, 8.]

[n] [tom. i. col. 285.]

ferred to *chorepiscopi*, not to *presbyteri civitatis*, unless we should strain this canon into a sense contrary to the practice of the catholic church; *res enim ordinis non possunt delegari*, is a most certain rule in divinity, and admitted by men of all sides and most different interests. However, we see here that they were prohibited; and we never find before this time that any of them actually did give orders, neither by ordinary power nor extraordinary dispensation; and the constant tradition of the church and practice apostolical is, that they never could give orders; therefore this exposition of the canon is liable to no exception, but is clear for the illegality of a presbyter's giving holy orders either to a presbyter or a deacon, and is concluding for the necessity of concurrence both of episcopal order and jurisdiction for ordinations. For *reddendo singula singulis*, and expounding this canon according to the sense of the church and exigence of catholic custom, the *chorepiscopi* are excluded from giving orders for want of jurisdiction, and the priests of the city for want of order; the first may be supplied by a delegate power *in literis episcopalibus*, the second cannot but by a new ordination, that is, by making the priest a bishop. For if a priest of the city have not so much power as a *chorepiscopus*, as I have proved he hath not by shewing that the *chorepiscopus* then had episcopal ordination, and yet the *chorepiscopus* might not collate orders without a faculty from the bishop, the city priests might not do it unless more be added to them, for their want was more: they not only want jurisdiction, but something besides, and that must needs be Order.

But although these *chorepiscopi* at the first had episcopal ordination, yet it was quickly taken from them for their encroachment upon the bishop's diocese; and as they were but *vicarii* or *visitatores episcoporum in villis*, so their ordination was but to a mere presbyterate. And this we find, as soon as ever we hear that they had had episcopal ordination; for those who in the beginning of the tenth canon of Antioch[o] we find had been consecrated as bishops, in the end of the same canon we find it decreed *de novo*, χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ᾗ ὑπόκειται ἐπισκόπου, 'the *chorepiscopus* or country bishop must be ordained by the bishop of the city in whose jurisdiction he is;' which was clearly ordination to the order of a presbyter and no more. And ever after this all the ordinations they made were only to the inferior ministries, with the bishop's license too; but they never ordained any to be deacons or priests; for these were orders of the Holy Ghost's appointing, and therefore were *gratia Spiritus sancti*, and issues of order; but the inferior ministries, as of a reader, an ostiary, &c., were human constitutions, and required not the capacity of episcopal order to collate them; for they were not 'graces of the Holy Ghost,' as all orders properly so called are, but might by human dispensation be bestowed, as well as by human ordinance they had their first constitution.

[o] [tom. i. col. 597.]

The *chorepiscopi* lasted in this consistence till they were quite taken away by the council of Hispalis[p]; save only that such men also were called *chorepiscopi* who had been bishops of cities, but had fallen from their honour by communicating in gentile sacrifices, and by being traditors; but in case they repented and were reconciled, they had not indeed restitution to their see, but because they had the indelible character of a bishop, they were allowed the name and honour, and sometimes the execution of offices chorepiscopal. Now of this sort of *chorepiscopi* no objection can be pretended if they had made ordinations; and of the other nothing pertinent, for they also had the ordination and order of bishops. The former was the case of Meletius in the Nicene council, as is to be seen in the epistle of the fathers to the church of Alexandria[q]. But however, all this while the power of ordination is so fast held in the bishop's hand that it was communicated to none though of the greatest privilege.

I find the like care taken in the council of Sardis[r]; for when Musæus and Eutychianus had ordained some clerks, themselves not being bishops, Gaudentius (one of the moderate men it is likely) for quietness' sake, and to comply with the times, would fain have had those clerks received into clerical communion; but the council would by no means admit that any should be received into the clergy, ἀλλ' ἐκείνους . . τοὺς ἱερωθέντας παρὰ τινῶν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὲν ὄντων ἐπισκόπων (as Balsamon[s] expresses upon that canon), 'but such as were ordained by them who were bishops verily and indeed.' But with those who were ordained by Musæus and Eutychianus, ὡς λαϊκοῖς συγκοινωνήσομεν, 'we will communicate as with laymen,' ὅτι οὐδὲ ὄνομα ἐπισκόπου δύνανται ἐκδικεῖν οἱ αὐτοὺς τάχα χειροτονήσαντες, 'for they were no bishops that imposed hands on them,' and therefore the clerks were not ordained truly, but were πλασάμενοι χειροτονίαν, 'dissemblers of ordination.' *Quæ autem de Musæo et Eutychiano dicta sunt trahe etiam ad alios qui non ordinati fuerunt, &c.*, saith Balsamon[t]; intimating that it is a ruled case, and of public interest.

The same was the issue of those two famous cases[u], the one of Ischyras ordained of Colluthus, φαντασθέντος ἐπισκοπὴν, 'one that dreamed only he was a bishop.' Ischyras being ordained by him could be no priest, nor any else of his ordaining, καὶ πᾶσα χεὶρ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν ἄκυρος· and Ischyras himself was reduced into lay-communion, being deposed by the synod of Alexandria, ἐκπεσὼν καὶ τῆς ψευδοῦς ὑπονοίας τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου, 'falling from the imagination of his presbyterate,' say the priests and deacons of Mareotis;

[p] [Concil. Hispal. ii. A.D. 619. cap. vii. tom. iii. col. 559.]

[q] Tripart. hist., lib. ii. cap. 12. [p. 229.] ex Theodoret.

[r] can. 19. [tom. i. col. 651.]

[s] [Apud Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 505.]

[t] [Ibid., p. 506.]

[u] Apud Athan. Apol. ii. epist. presb. et diacon. Mareotic. ad Curiosum et Philagrium. [Athan. opp., tom. i. pp. 193 A, 134 B, 191 A.]

and of the rest that were ordained with Ischyras, λαϊκοὶ γεγόνασι, καὶ οὕτω συνάγονται, saith St. Athanasius: and this so known a business ὡς οὐδενὶ καθέστηκεν ἀμφίβολον, 'no man made scruple of the nullity.'—The parallel case is of the presbyters ordained by Maximus, who was another bishop in the air too; all his ordinations were pronounced null by the fathers of the council in Constantinople[x].—A third is of the blind bishop of Agabra imposing hands while his presbyters read the words of ordination; the ordination was pronounced invalid by the first[y] council of Sevil[z]. These cases are so known, I need not insist on them. This only,

In divers cases of transgression of the canons clergymen were reduced to lay-communion, either being suspended, or deposed; that is, from their place of honour and execution of their function, with or without hope of restitution respectively; but then still they had their order, and the sacraments conferred by them were valid, though they indeed were prohibited to minister; but in the cases of the present instance, the ordinations were pronounced as null, to have bestowed nothing, and to be merely imaginary.

But so also it was in case that bishops ordained without a title, or in the diocese of another bishop, as in the council of Chalcedon[a], and of Antioch[b], πάντα ἄκυρα· and may be it was so in case of ordination by a presbyter, it was by positive constitution pronounced void and no more, and, therefore may be rescinded by the countermand of an equal power; a council at most may do it; and therefore without a council, a probable necessity will let us loose.—But to this the answer is evident;—

1. The expressions in the several cases are several and of diverse issue; for in case of those nullities which are merely canonical they are expressed as then first made, but in the case of ordination by a non-bishop they are only declared void *ipso facto*. And therefore in that decree of Chalcedon against sine-titular ordinations the canon saith, τοὺς δὲ ἀπολύτως χειροτονουμένους ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἄκυρον ἔχειν τὴν τοιαύτην χειροθεσίαν, *irritam existimari manus impositionem*, 'to be esteemed as null,' that is, not to have canonical approbation, but is not declared null *in natura rei*, as it is in the foregoing instances.

2. In the cases of Antioch and Chalcedon the decree is *pro futuro*, which makes it evident that those nullities are such as are made by canon; but in the cases of Colluthus and Maximus there was declaration of a past nullity, and that before any canon was made; and though synodical declarations pronounced such ordinations invalid, yet none decreed so for the future; which is a clear evidence that this nullity, viz., in case of ordination by a non-presbyter, is not

[x] can. iv. [tom. i. col. 809.]
[y] [al. 'second.']
[z] cap. v. [tom. iii. col. 559.]
[a] can. vi. [tom. ii. col. 603.]
[b] can. xiii. [tom. i. col. 599.]

made by canon, but by canon declared to be invalid in the nature of the thing.

3. If to this be added that in antiquity it was dogmatically resolved that by nature and institution of the order of bishops ordination was appropriate to them, then it will also from hence be evident that the nullity of ordination without a bishop is not dependent upon positive constitution, but on the exigence of the institution. Now that the power of ordination was only in the bishop, even they who to advance the presbyters were willing enough to speak less for episcopacy, give testimony; making this the proper distinctive cognizance of a bishop from a presbyter, that the bishop hath power of ordination, the presbyter hath not. So St. Hierome[c], *Quid facit episcopus excepta ordinatione quod presbyter non faciat?* 'All things,' saith he, (to wit, all things of precise order,) 'are common to bishops with priests, except ordination,' for that is proper to the bishop. And St. Chrysostom[d], *Sola quippe ordinatione superiores illis sunt episcopi, atque hoc tantum plus quam presbyteri habere videntur.* Ordination is the proper and peculiar function of a bishop, and therefore not given him by positive constitution of the canon.

4. No man was called a heretic for breach of canon, but for denying the power of ordination to be proper to a bishop Aërius was by Epiphanius, Philastrius, and St. Austin, condemned and branded for heresy, and by the catholic church, saith Epiphanius[e]; this power therefore came from a higher spring than positive and canonical sanction. But now proceed.

The council held *in Trullo*[f], complaining of the incursion of the barbarous people upon the church's inheritance, saith that it forced some bishops from their residence, and made that they could not κατὰ τὸ κρατῆσαν ἔθος τὰς χειροτονίας καὶ πάντα ἃ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀνήκει πράττειν τε καὶ μεταχειρίζεσθαι, 'according to the guise of the church give orders and do such things as did belong to the bishop:' and in the sequel of the canon they are permitted in such cases *ut et diversorum clericorum ordinationes canonice faciant*, 'to make canonical ordinations of clergymen.' Giving of orders is proper, it belongs to a bishop; so the council. And therefore Theodoret[g] expounding that place of St. Paul, 'by the laying on the hands of the presbytery,' interprets it of bishops; for this reason, because presbyters did not impose hands. There is an imperfect canon in the Arausican council[h] that hath an expression very pertinent to this purpose; *Ea quæ non nisi per episcopos geruntur*, 'those things that are not done but by bishops,' they were decreed still to be done by bishops though he that was to do them regularly did fall into any infirmity whatsoever, yet *non sub præsentia sua presbyteros agere per-*

[c] Ad Evagrium. [vid. p. 71. not. f. supr.]
[d] Hom. xi. in 1 Tim. iii. [interpr. Front. Ducæo, tom. x. p. 1574.]
[e] [Hær. lxxv. p. 906 sq.]
[f] can. xxxvii. [tom. iii. col. 1676.]
[g] [In 1 Tim. iv. 14, tom. iii. p. 662.]
[h] [can. xxx. tom. i. col. 1786.]

mittat sed evocet episcopum. Here are clearly by this canon some things supposed to be proper to the bishops, to the action of which presbyters must in no case be admitted. The particulars what they are, are not specified in the canon, but are named before, viz., orders and confirmation; for almost the whole council was concerning them, and nothing else is properly the *agendum episcopi*, and the canon else is not to be understood. To the same issue is that circumlocutory description or name of a bishop, used by St. Chrysostom[i], ὁ μέλλων ἡμᾶς χειροτονήσειν, 'the man that is to ordain clerks.'

And all this is but the doctrine of the catholic church which St. Epiphanius[j] opposed to the doctrine of Aërius, denying episcopacy to be a distinct order; ἡ μὲν γὰρ, speaking of episcopacy, ἐστὶ πατέρων γεννητικὴ τάξις, πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἡ δὲ πατέρας μὴ δυναμένη γεννᾷν, speaking of presbytery; 'the order of bishops begets fathers to the church of God, but the order of presbyters begets' sons in baptism, but 'no fathers' or doctors by ordination.—It is a very remarkable passage related by Eusebius[k] in the ordination of Novatus to be presbyter, the bishop did it διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ πάντος τοῦ κλήρου, 'all the whole clergy was against it,' yet the bishop did ordain him, and then certainly scarce any conjunction of the other clergy can be imagined; I am sure none is either expressed or intimated. For it was a ruled case, and attested by the uniform practice of the church, which was set down in the third council of Carthage[l], *Episcopus unus esse potest, per quem dignatione divina presbyteri multi constitui possunt.* This case I instance the more particularly because it is an exact determination of a bishop's sole power of ordination. Aurelius made a motion, that if a church wanted a presbyter to become her bishop, they might demand one from any bishop. It was granted; but Posthumianus the bishop put this case, *Deinde qui unum habuerit, numquid debet illi ipse unus presbyter auferri?* 'how if the bishop have but one priest, must his bishop part with him to supply the necessity of the neighbour widow church?' Yea, that he must. But how then shall he keep ordinations when he hath never a presbyter to assist him? That indeed would have been the objection now, but it was none then; for Aurelius told them plainly there was no inconvenience in it; for though a bishop have never a presbyter, no great matter, he can himself ordain many (and then I am sure there is a sole ordination), but if a bishop be wanting to a church he is not so easily found.

Thus it went ordinarily in the style of the church, ordinations were made by the bishop, and the ordainer spoken of as a single person. So it is in the Nicene council[m], the council of Antioch[n], the council

[i] [vid. Suicer. χειροτονέω et χειροτονία.]
[j] Hær. lxxv. [§ 4. p. 908 A.]
[k] Hist. eccl., lib. vi. cap. 33. [al. 43.]
[l] can. xlv. [tom. i. col. 967.]
[m] can. xix. [tom. i. col. 331.]
[n] can. ix. [tom. i. col. 597.]

of Chalcedon[o], and St. Hierome[p], who, writing to Pammachius against the errors of John of Jerusalem, "If thou speak," saith he, "of Paulinianus, he comes now and then to visit us, not as any of your clergy, but *ejus a quo ordinatus est*, that bishop's who ordained him."

So that the issue of this argument is this. The canons of the apostles and the rules of the ancient councils appropriate the ordination of bishops to bishops, of presbyters to one bishop (for I never find a presbyter ordained by two bishops together, but only Origen[q] by the bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea;) presbyters are never mentioned in conjunction with bishops at their ordinations, and if alone they did it, their ordination was pronounced invalid and void *ab initio*.

To these particulars add this, that bishops alone were punished if ordinations were uncanonical, which were most unreasonable if presbyters did join in them and were causes in conjunction; but unless they did it alone, we never read that they were punishable. Indeed bishops were *pro toto et integro*, as is reported by Sozomen[r] in the case of Elpidius, Eustathius, Basilius of Ancyra, and Eleusius. Thus also it was decreed in the second and sixth chapters of the council of Chalcedon, and in the Imperial Constitutions[s]. Since therefore we never find presbyters joined with bishops in commission, or practice, or penalty, all this while; I may infer from the premises the same thing which the council of Hispalis[t] expresses in direct and full sentence, *Episcopus sacerdotibus ac ministris solus honorem dare potest, auferre solus non potest*, 'the bishop alone may give the priestly honour, he alone is not suffered to take it away.' This council was held in the year 657, and I set it down here for this purpose, to shew that the decree of the fourth council of Carthage[u], which was the first that licensed priests to assist bishops in ordinations, yet was not obligatory in the west; but for almost three hundred years after ordinations were made by bishops alone. But till this council no pretence of any such conjunction, and after this council sole ordination did not expire in the west for above two hundred years together; but for aught I know, ever since then it hath obtained, that although presbyters join not in the consecration of a bishop, yet of a presbyter they do; but this is only by a positive subintroduced constitution, first made in a provincial of Africa, and in other places received by insinuation and conformity of practice.

I know not what can be said against it. I only find a piece of an objection out of St. Cyprian[x], who was a man so complying with the subjects of his diocese, that if any man, he was like to furnish us

[o] can. ii. et vi. [tom. ii. col. 602 sq.]
[p] [Ep. xxxviii. tom. iv. part. ii. col. 332 fin.]
[q] [Euseb. hist. eccl. vi. 8.]
[r] [lib. iv. cap. 24.]
[s] Novell. const. vi. [cap. 1.] et cxxiii. cap. 16. [tom. iii. col. 257.]
[t] cap. vi. [tom. iii. col. 559.]
[u] can. ii. et iii. [tom. i. col. 979.]
[x] Epist. xxxiii. [al. xxxviii. p. 75.]

with an antinomy; *Hunc igitur, fratres dilectissimi, a me et a collegis qui præsentes aderant ordinatum sciatis.* Here either by his 'colleagues' he means bishops or presbyters: if bishops, then many bishops will be found in the ordination of one to an inferior order, which because it was, as I observed before, against the practice of christendom, will not easily be admitted to be the sense of St. Cyprian; but if he means presbyters by *collegæ*, then sole ordination is invalidated by this example, for presbyters joined with him in the ordination of Aurelius.

I answer, that it matters not whether by his colleagues he means one or the other; for Aurelius the confessor, who was the man ordained, was ordained but to be a reader, and that was no order of divine institution, no gift of the Holy Ghost, and therefore might be dispensed by one or more, by bishops or presbyters, and no way enters into the consideration of this question concerning the power of collating those orders which are gifts of the Holy Ghost, and of divine ordinance; and therefore this, although I have seen it once pretended, yet hath no validity to impugn the constant practice of primitive antiquity.

But then are all ordinations invalid which are done by mere presbyters without a bishop? What think we of the reformed churches?

1. For my part I know not what to think; the question hath been so often asked, with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound by public interest to approve all that they do, that we have disabled ourselves to justify our own. For we were glad at first of abettors against the errors of the Roman church; we found these men zealous in it; we thanked God for it, as we had cause; and we were willing to make them recompense by endeavouring to justify their ordinations, not thinking what would follow upon ourselves: but now it is come to that issue that our own episcopacy is thought not necessary, because we did not condemn the ordinations of their presbytery.

2. Why is not the question rather what we think of the primitive church than what we think of the reformed churches? Did the primitive councils and fathers do well in condemning the ordinations made by mere presbyters? If they did well, what was a virtue in them is no sin in us: if they did ill, from what principle shall we judge of the right of ordinations? since there is no example in scripture of any ordination made but by apostles and bishops; and the presbytery that imposed hands on Timothy is by all antiquity expounded either of the office[y], or of a college of presbyters; and St. Paul expounds it to be an ordination made by his own hands, as appears by comparing the two epistles to St. Timothy together; and may be so meant by the principles of all sides; for if the names be confounded, then presbyter may signify a bishop; and that they of

[y] [vid. p. 103 supra.]

this presbytery were not bishops they can never prove from scripture, where all men grant that the names are confounded.

So that whence will men take their estimate for the rites of ordinations? from scripture? That gives it always to apostles and bishops, as I have proved; and that a priest did ever impose hands for ordination can never be shewn from thence. From whence then; from antiquity? That was so far from licensing ordinations made by presbyters alone that presbyters in the primitive church did never join with bishops in collating holy orders of presbyter and deacon, till the fourth council of Carthage; much less do it alone, rightly and with effect. So that as in scripture there is nothing for presbyters ordaining, so in antiquity there is much against it; and either in this particular we must have strange thoughts of scripture and antiquity, or not so fair interpretation of the ordinations of reformed presbyteries: but for my part I had rather speak a truth in sincerity, than err with a glorious correspondence.

But will not necessity excuse them who could not have orders from orthodox bishops? Shall we either sin against our consciences, by subscribing to heretical and false resolutions *in materia fidei*, or else lose the being of a church for want of episcopal ordinations? Indeed if the case were just thus, it was very hard with good people of the transmarine churches; but I have here two things to consider.

First, I am very willing to believe that they would not have done any thing either of error or suspicion, but in cases of necessity. But then I consider that M. Du Plessis[z], a man of honour and great learning, does attest that at the first reformation there were many archbishops and cardinals in Germany, England, France, and Italy, that joined in the reformation, whom they might, but did not, employ in their ordinations; and what necessity then can be pretended in this case I would fain learn, that I might make their defence. But, which is of more and deeper consideration, for this might have been done by inconsideration and irresolution, as often happens in the beginning of great changes,—but it is their constant and resolved practice, at least in France, that if any returns to them they will re-ordain him by their presbytery, though he had before episcopal ordination; as both their friends and their enemies bear witness[a].

Secondly I consider, that necessity may excuse a personal delinquency, but I never heard that necessity did build a church. Indeed no man is forced for his own particular to commit a sin; for if it be absolutely a case of necessity, the action ceaseth to be a sin; but indeed if God means to build a church in any place, He will do it by

[z] De Eccles. cap. 11. [p. 487 sq. 8vo. 1599.]

[a] Danæus, Isagog. part. iii. lib. ii. cap. 22. [leg. potius 23, p. 237 sqq.]—Perron, Repl. [aux ministres, &c.] fol. 92. impress. 1605. [cap. 46 fin. p. 48. fol. Par. 1622.]

means proportionable to that end; that is, by putting them into a possibility of doing and acquiring those things which Himself hath required of necessity to the constitution of a church. So that supposing that ordination by a bishop is necessary for the vocation of priests and deacons (as I have proved it is) and therefore for the founding or perpetuating of a church, either God hath given to all churches opportunity and possibility of such ordinations, and then necessity of the contrary is but pretence and mockery; or if He hath not given such possibility, then there is no church there to be either built or continued, but the candlestick is presently removed.

There are divers stories in Ruffinus[b] to this purpose. When Ædesius and Frumentius were surprised by the barbarous Indians, they preached christianity, and baptized many; but themselves being but laymen could make no ordinations, and so not fix a church. What then was to be done in the case? *Frumentius Alexandriam pergit, . . et rem omnem ut gesta est narrat*[c] *episcopo, ac monet ut provideat virum aliquem dignum quem congregatis jam plurimis christianis . . in barbarico solo episcopum mittat;* 'Frumentius comes to Alexandria to get a bishop.' Athanasius being then patriarch ordained Frumentius their bishop, *et tradito ei sacerdotio redire eum cum Domini gratia unde venerat jubet; . . ex quo,* saith Ruffinus[d], *in Indiæ partibus et populi christianorum et ecclesiæ factæ sunt, et sacerdotium cœpit.*—The same happened in the case of the Iberians, converted by a captive woman; *postea vero quam ecclesia magnifice constructa est, et populi fidem Dei majore ardore sitiebant, captivæ monitis ad imperatorem Constantinum totius gentis legatio mittitur; res gesta exponitur; sacerdotes mittere oratur qui cœptum erga se Dei munus implerent;* the work of christianity could not be completed nor a church founded without the ministry of bishops.

Thus the case is evident, that the want of a bishop will not excuse us from our endeavours of acquiring one; and where God means to found a church, there He will supply them with those means and ministers which Himself hath made of ordinary and absolute necessity. And therefore if it happens that those bishops which are of ordinary ministration amongst us prove heretical, still God's church is catholic, and though with trouble, yet orthodox bishops may be acquired. For just so it happened[e] when Mauvia queen of the Saracens was so earnest to have Moses the hermit made the bishop of her nation, and offered peace to the catholics upon that condition; Lucius an Arian troubled the affair by his interposing and offering to ordain Moses: the hermit discovered his vileness, *et ita majore dedecore deformatus compulsus est acquiescere.* Moses refused to be ordained by him that was an Arian. So did the re-

[b] Eccles. hist., lib. x. cap. 9. per Ruffinum. [p. 225 sq.]

[c] [ed. 'exponit.']

[d] Eccles. hist., lib. x. cap. 10. [p. 227.] et apud Theodoret. lib. i. [cap. 24.]

[e] Eccles. hist., lib. xi. cap. 6. per Ruffinum. [p. 246. vid. p. 106 supra.]

formed churches refuse ordinations by the bishops of the Roman communion. But what then might they have done? Even the same that Moses did in that necessity, *Compulsus est ab episcopis quos in exilium truserat* (*Lucius*) *sacerdotium sumere;* those good people might have had order from the bishops of England, or the Lutheran churches, if at least they thought our churches catholic and christian.

If an ordinary necessity will not excuse this, will not an extraordinary calling justify it? yea, most certainly, could we but see an ordinary proof for an extraordinary calling, viz., an evident prophecy, demonstration of miracles, certainty of reason, clarity of sense, or any thing that might make faith of an extraordinary mission.

But shall we then condemn those few of the reformed churches whose ordinations always have been without bishops? No indeed, that must not be; they stand or fall to their own master. And though I cannot justify their ordinations, yet what degree their necessity is of, what their desire of episcopal ordinations may do for their personal excuse, and how far a good life and a catholic belief may lead a man in the way to heaven although the forms of external communion be not observed, I cannot determine. For aught I know, their condition is the same with that of the church of Pergamus[f], "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is; and thou heldest fast My faith, and hast not denied My name; *nihilominus habeo adversus te pauca,* some few things I have against thee;" and yet of them, the want of canonical ordinations is a defect which I trust themselves desire to be remedied; but if it cannot be done, their sin indeed is the less, but their misery the greater. I am sure I have said sooth, but whether or no it will be thought so, I cannot tell; and yet why it may not, I cannot guess, unless they only be impeccable; which I suppose will not so easily be thought of them, who themselves think that all the church possibly may fail. But this I would not have declared so freely, had not the necessity of our own churches required it, and that the first pretence of the legality and validity of their ordinations been buoyed up to the height of an absolute necessity; for else why shall it be called tyranny in us to call on them to conform to us and to the practice of the catholic church, and yet in them be called a good and a holy zeal to exact our conformity to them; but I hope it will so happen to us, that it will be verified here what was once said of the catholics under the fury of Justina[g], *Sed tanta fuit perseverantia fidelium populorum ut animas prius amittere quam episcopum mallent;* if it were put to our choice rather to die (to wit the death of martyrs, not rebels) than lose the sacred order and offices of episcopacy, without which no priest, no ordination, no consecration of the sacrament, no

[f] [Rev. ii. 13.]

[g] [Ruffin. hist. eccl. xi. 15. p. 251.]

absolution, no rite, or sacrament, legitimately can be performed in order to eternity.

The sum is this. If the canons and sanctions apostolical; if the decrees of eight famous councils in christendom, of Ancyra, of Antioch, of Sardis, of Alexandria, two of Constantinople, the Arausican council, and that of Hispalis; if the constant successive acts of the famous martyr-bishops of Rome making ordinations; if the testimony of the whole pontifical book; if the dogmatical resolution of so many fathers, St. Denis, St. Cornelius, St. Athanasius, St. Hierome, St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, St. Austin, and divers others, all appropriating ordinations to the bishop's hand; if the constant voice of christendom declaring ordinations made by presbyters to be null and void in the nature of the thing; and never any act of ordination by a non-bishop approved by any council, decretal, or single suffrage of any famous man in christendom; if that ordinations of bishops were always made, and they ever done by bishops, and no pretence of priests joining with them in their consecrations, and after all this it was declared heresy to communicate the power of giving orders to presbyters, either alone or in conjunction with bishops, as it was in the case of Aërius; if all this, that is, if whatsoever can be imagined be sufficient to make faith in this particular, then it is evident that the power and order of bishops is greater than the power and order of presbyters, to wit, in this great particular of ordination, and that by this loud voice and united vote of christendom.

§ 33. And confirmation.

But this was but the first part of the power which catholic antiquity affixed to the order of episcopacy; the next is of confirmation of baptized people. And here the rule was this, which was thus expressed by Damascene[h], *Apostolorum et successorum eorum est per manus impositionem donum Spiritus sancti tradere,* 'it belongs to the apostles and their successors to give the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands.' But see this in particular instance.

The council of Eliberis[i], giving permission to faithful people of the laity to baptize catechumens in the cases of necessity and exigence of journey, *Ita tamen ut si supervixerit baptizatus, ad episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem proficere possit,* 'let him be carried to the bishop to be improved by imposition of the bishop's hands;' this was law.

It was also a custom, saith St. Cyprian[k], *quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum*

[h] [Leg. 'Damasus.'] Epist. [v.] de chorepisc. [Concil. Reg. tom. iii. p. 288.]

[i] [can. xxxviii. tom. i. p. 254.]

[k] Epist. ad Jubaian [ep. lxxiii. p. 202.]

sanctum consequantur et signaculo Dominico consummentur. And this custom was catholic too, and the law was of universal concernment; *Omnes . . fideles per manus impositionem episcoporum Spiritum sanctum post baptismum accipere debent ut plene christiani inveniantur,* so St. Urban[l] in his decretal epistle; and, *Omnibus festinandum est sine mora renasci . . et demum consignari ab episcopo, et*[m] *septiformem Spiritus sancti gratiam recipere,* so saith the old author of the fourth epistle under the name of St. Clement[n]; all faithful baptized people must go to the bishop to be consigned, and so by imposition of hands to obtain the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost.'

Meltiades[o] in his epistle to the bishops of Spain[p] affirms confirmation in this to have a special excellency besides baptism, *quod solum a summis sacerdotibus confertur,* 'because bishops only can give confirmation;' and the same is said and proved by St. Eusebius[q] in his third epistle, enjoining great veneration to this holy mystery, *quod ab aliis perfici non potest nisi a summis sacerdotibus,* 'it cannot, it may not, be performed by any but by the bishops.'

Thus St. Chrysostom[r] speaking of St. Philip converting the Samaritans, διὸ καὶ βαπτίζων πνεῦμα τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις οὐκ ἐδίδου· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ δῶρον μόνων τῶν δώδεκα ἦν· 'Philip baptizing the men of Samaria gave not the Holy Ghost to them whom he had baptized, for he had not power; for this gift was only of the twelve apostles;' and a little after, τοῦτο ἦν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐξαίρετον, 'this was peculiar to the apostles;' ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους, οὐκ ἄλλους τινάς ἐστιν ἰδεῖν τοῦτο ποιοῦντας, 'whence it comes to pass that the principal and chief of the church do it, and none else.' And George Pachymeres[s], the paraphrast of St. Dionysius, Χρεία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἔσται εἰς τὸ χρῖσαι τῷ μύρῳ τὸν βαπτισθέντα, αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἀρχαία συνήθεια, 'it is required that a bishop should consign faithful people baptized, for this was the ancient practice.'

I shall not need to instance in too many particulars, for that the ministry of confirmation was by catholic custom appropriate to bishops in all ages of the primitive church is to be seen by the concurrent testimony of councils and fathers, particularly of St. Clemens Alexandrinus in Eusebius[t], Tertullian[u], St. Innocentius the first[x], Damasus[y], St. Leo[z], in John the third[a], in St. Gregory[b], Amphi-

[l] Apud Sev. Binium, in 1 tom. Concil. [p. 88. col. 2.]
[m] ['id est,' edd.]
[n] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 128.]
[o] [al. 'Miltiades,' 'Melchiades.']
[p] [vid. § 2. init.—Harduin. Concil., tom. i. col. 245.]
[q] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 689.]
[r] In Act. apost., hom. xviii. [§ 3. tom. ix. p. 146 E.]
[s] In cap. 5. de Eccles. hierarch. [p. 72, ad calc. opp. S. Dionys.]
[t] [vid. p. 30, not. l, supr.]
[u] De baptism. [vid. cap. viii. p. 226.]
[x] Ep. i. cap. 3. Ad Decent. [p. 6.]
[y] [Ep. v. de chorepisc.—Concil. Reg., tom. iii. p. 288.]
[z] Epist. lxxxviii. [p. 158 E.]
[a] [Epist. unica, § 1.—Concil. Reg., tom. xii. p. 549.]
[b] Lib. iii. [al. iv.] ep. ix. [tom. ii. col. 689.]

lochius in the life of St. Basil[c] telling the story of bishop Maximinus confirming Basilius and Eubulus, the council of Orleans[d], and of Melda[e], and lastly of Sevill[f], which affirms *non licere presbyteris . . per impositionem manus fidelibus baptizandis*[g] *Paracletum spiritum tradere,* 'it is not lawful for presbyters to give confirmation,' for it is properly an act of episcopal power; *chrismate Spiritus S. superinfunditur; utraque vero ista manu et ore antistitis impetramus.* These are enough for authority and dogmatical resolution, from antiquity. For truth is, the first that ever did communicate the power of confirming to presbyters was Photius, the first author of that unhappy and long-lasting schism between the Latin and Greek churches, and it was upon this occasion too: for when the Bulgarians[h] were first converted, the Greeks sent presbyters to baptize and to confirm them; but the Latin sent again to have them re-confirmed; both because (as they pretended) the Greeks had no jurisdiction in Bulgaria, nor the presbyters a capacity of order to give confirmation.

The matters of fact, and acts episcopal of confirmation, are innumerable; but most famous are those confirmations made by St. Rembert bishop of Brema, and of St. Malchus attested by St. Bernard, because they were ratified by a miracle, saith the ancient story[i]. I end this with the saying of St. Hierome[j], *Exigis ubi scriptum sit? In Actibus apostolorum. Etiamsi scripturæ auctoritas non subesset, totius orbis in hanc partem consensus instar præcepti obtineret;* 'if you ask where it is written' (viz., that bishops alone should confirm) 'it is written in the Acts of the apostles' (meaning by precedent though not express precept); but 'if there were no authority of scripture for it, yet the consent of all the world upon this particular is instead of a command.'

It was fortunate that St. Hierome hath expressed himself so confidently in this affair, for by this we are armed against an objection from his own words; for in the same dialogue[k], speaking of some acts of episcopal privilege and peculiar ministration, particularly of confirmation, he says, it was *ad honorem potius sacerdotii quam ad legis necessitatem*[l], 'for the honour of the priesthood rather than for the necessity of a law.'—To this the answer is evident from his own words; 'That bishops should give the Holy Ghost in confirmation is

[c] [Cap. 4. Apud Rosweyd. de vitt. patrum, p. 119.]
[d] Apud Gratian. de Consecr., dist. v. can. [6.] 'Ut jejuni.' [col. 2224.]
[e] Ibid., can. [7.] 'Ut episcopi.' [ibid.]
[f] Concil. Hispal. [ii.] can. vii. [tom. iii. col. 560.]
[g] [al. 'baptizatis.']
[h] Vid. Anasta. biblioth. præfat. in can. 8. Synodi. [i. e. Anastasium Bibliothecarium, Præfationem in Synodum viii. Œcumenicam, scil. Constantinop. iv.—Harduin., tom. v. col. 749 sqq.]
[i] Vide Optatum, lib. ii. cap. 25. [p. 48.] S. Bernard. in vit. S. Malachiæ. [col. 1932 M.] Surium, tom. i. in Febr. [iv. p. 861.]
[j] Dial. adv. Lucif. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 294.]
[k] [Ubi supra, col. seq.]
[l] [al. 'legem necessitatis.']

written in the Acts of the apostles;' and now that this is reserved 'rather for the honour of episcopacy than a simple necessity in the nature of the thing,' makes no matter. For the question here that is only of concernment, is not to what end this power is reserved to the bishop, but by whom it was reserved? Now St. Hierome says it was done *apud Acta*, 'in the scripture;' therefore by God's Holy Spirit; and the end he also specifies, viz., 'for the honour of that sacred order,' *non propter legis necessitatem*, 'not that there is any necessity of law' that confirmation should be administered by the bishop. Not that a priest may do it, but that (as St. Hierome himself there argues) the Holy Ghost being already given in baptism, if it happens that bishops may not be had, (for he puts the case concerning persons in bondage, and places remote and destitute of bishops,) then in that case there is not the absolute necessity of a law that confirmation should be had at all: a man does not perish if he have it not; for that this thing was reserved to a bishop's peculiar ministration, was indeed an honour to the function, but it was not for the necessity of a law, tying people in all cases actually to acquire it. So that this *non necessarium* is not to be referred to the bishop's ministration, as if it were not necessary for him to do it when it is to be done; not[m] that a priest may do it if a bishop may not be had; but this non-necessity is to be referred to confirmation itself; so that if a bishop cannot be had, confirmation, though with much loss, yet with no danger, may be omitted. This is the sum of St. Hierome's discourse, this reconciles him to himself, this makes him speak conformably to his first assertions, and consequently to his arguments; and to be sure no exposition can make these words to intend that this reservation of the power of confirmation to bishops is not done by the Spirit of God, and then let the sense of the words be what they will, they can do no hurt to the cause; and as easily may we escape from those words of his to Rusticus bishop of Narbona[n], *Et quia scriptum est, Presbyteri duplici honore honorentur, .. prædicare eos decet, utile est benedicere, congruum confirmare, &c.* It is quoted by Gratian[o], dist. xcv. can. *'Ecce ego.'* But the gloss upon the place expounds him thus, *i.e., in fide;* 'the presbyters may preach, they may confirm their auditors, not by consignation of chrism but by confirmation of faith;' and for this quotes a parallel place[p] for the use of the word *confirmare* by authority of St. Gregory, who sent Zachary his legate into Germany from the see of Rome, *Ut orthodoxos episcopos, presbyteros, vel quoscunque reperire potuisset in verbo exhortationis perfectos, amplius confirmaret.* Certainly St. Gregory did not intend that his legate Zachary should confirm bishops and priests in any other sense but this of St. Hierome's in the present, to wit, in faith and doctrine, not in rite and mystery; and

[m] ['nor,' C.]
[n] [In lib. De sept. ord. eccles., tom. v. col. 104.]
[o] [col. 498.]
[p] Caus. xi. q. 3. can. [105.] 'Quod prædecessor.' [col. 1045.]

neither could St. Hierome himself intend that presbyters should do it at all but in this sense of St. Gregory; for else he becomes an *anti-strephon*, and his own opposite.

Yea, but there is a worse matter than this; St. Ambrose[q] tells of the Egyptian priests, that they 'in the absence of the bishop do confirm;' *denique apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus.* But,

1. The passage is suspicious, for it interrupts a discourse of St. Ambrose's concerning the primitive order of election to the bishopric, and is no way pertinent to the discourse, but is encircled with a story of a far different consequence, which is not easily thought to have been done by any considering and intelligent author.

2. But suppose the clause be not surreptitious, but natural to the discourse and born with it, yet it is matter of fact, not of right; for St. Ambrose neither approves nor disproves it, and so it must go for a singular act against the catholic practice and laws of christendom.

3. If the whole clause be not surreptitious, yet the word *consignant* is; for St. Austin, who hath the same discourse, the same thing, viz., of the dignity of presbyters, tells this story of the act and honour of presbyters in Alexandria and all Egypt almost in the other words of his master St. Ambrose; but he tells it thus[r], *Nam et in Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.* So that it should not be *consignat* but *consecrat;* for no story tells of any confirmations done in Egypt by presbyters, but of consecrating the eucharist in case of episcopal absence or commission, I shall give account in the question of jurisdiction; that was indeed permitted in Egypt and some other places, but confirmation never that we can find elsewhere; and this is too improbable to bear weight against evidence and practice apostolical, and four councils, and sixteen ancient catholic fathers, testifying that it was a practice and a law of christendom that bishops only should confirm, and not priests; so that if there be no other scruple this question is quickly at an end.

But St. Gregory[s] is also pretended in objection, for he gave dispensation to the priests of Sardinia *ut baptizatos ungant,* 'to anele baptized people:' now anointing the forehead of the baptized person was one of the solemnities of confirmation, so that this indulgence does arise to a power of confirming; for *unctio* and *chrismatio,* in the first Arausican council, and since that time *sacramentum chrismatis,* hath been the usual word for confirmation.—But this will not much trouble the business, because it is evident that he means it not of confirmation, but of the chrism in those times by the rites of the

[q] [Pseudo-Ambros.] in Eph. iv. [ver. 11. tom. ii. append. col. 241 F.]

[r] Quæst. ci. Vet. et nov. test. Basileæ. [tom. iii. part. 2. append. col. 93 A.]

[s] Lib. iii. [al. iv.] epist. 26. [tom. ii. col. 705.—Sed vid. not. e, infra.]

church used in baptism: for in his ninth epistle he forbids priests to anoint baptized people; now here is precept against precept; therefore it must be understood of several anointings. And so St. Gregory[t] expounds himself in this ninth epistle, *Presbyteri*[u] *baptizatos infantes signare bis in fronte chrismate non præsumant,* 'presbyters may not anoint baptized people twice,' once they might. Now that this permission of anointing was that which was a ceremony of baptism, not an act of confirmation, we shall see by comparing it with other canons. In the collection of the oriental canons by Martinus Bracarensis[x], it is decreed thus; *Presbyter præsente episcopo non signet infantes, nisi forte ab episcopo fuerit illi præceptum;* 'a priest must not sign infants without leave of the bishop if he be present.' 'Must not sign them;' that is, with chrism in their foreheads, and that in baptism; for the circumstant canons do expressly explicate and determine it; for they are concerning the rites of baptism, and this in the midst of them.—And by the way this may answer St. Ambrose[y] his *presbyteri consignant absente episcopo,* in case it be so to be read; for here we see a consignation permitted to the presbyters in the eastern churches to be used in baptism, in the absence of the bishop, and this an act of indulgence and favour, and therefore extraordinary, and of use to St. Ambrose his purpose of advancing the presbyters, but yet of no objection in case of confirmation. And indeed *consignari* is used in antiquity for any signing with the cross, and aneling. Thus it is used in the first Arausican council[z] for extreme unction, which is there in case of extreme necessity permitted to presbyters; *hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, a presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet.* 'Consigned' is the word, and it was clearly in extreme unction; for that rite was not then ceased, and it was in aneling a dying body, and a part of reconciliation, and so limited by the sequent canon, and not to be fancied of any other consignation.—But I return. The first council of Toledo[a] prohibits any from making chrism but bishops only, and takes order *ut de singulis ecclesiis ad episcopum ante diem paschæ diaconi destinentur, ut confectum chrisma ab episcopo destinatum ad diem paschæ possit occurrere,* 'that the chrism be fetched by the deacons from the bishops to be used in all churches.' But for what use? Why, it was *destinatum ad diem paschæ,* says the canon, 'against the holy time of Easter;' and then at Easter was the solemnity of public baptisms, so that it was to be used in baptism. And this sense being premised, the canon permits to presbyters to sign with chrism, the same

[t] [lib. iv. ep. 9. tom. ii. col. 689 A.]
[u] [al. 'episcopi;' sed vid. Gratian. de consecr., dist. iv. c. 120. col. 2203.]
[x] Can. lii. [vid. p. 49, not. r, supra.]
[y] [In Eph. iv. 11. tom. ii. append. col. 241 F.]
[z] [can. i. tom. i. col. 1783 D.]
[a] Can. xx. [tom. i. col. 992.]

thing that St. Gregory[b] did to the priests of Sardinia; *Statutum vero est diaconum non chrismare, sed presbyterum absente episcopo; præsente vero, si ab ipso fuerit præceptum.* Now although this be evident enough, yet it is something clearer in the first Arausican council[c], *Nullus ministrorum qui baptizandi recipit officium sine chrismate usquam debet progredi, quia inter nos placuit semel in baptismate chrismari.* The case is evident, that chrismation or consigning with ointment was used in baptism; and it is as evident that this chrismation was it which St. Gregory permitted to the presbyters, not the other; for he expressly forbade the other; and the exigence of the canons, and practice of the church, expound it so; and it is the same which St. Innocent the first[d] decreed in more express and distinctive terms, *Presbyteris chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum;* there is a clear permission of consigning with chrism in baptism, but he subjoins a prohibition to priests for doing it in confirmation; *Non tamen frontem eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradunt Spiritum sanctum Paracletum.*

By the way; some, that they might the more clearly determine St. Gregory's dispensation to be only in baptismal chrism, read it, *Ut baptizandos ungant,* not *baptizatos;* so Gratian[e], so St. Thomas[e]; but it is needless to be troubled with that, for Innocentius in the decretal now quoted useth the word *baptizatos,* and yet clearly distinguishes this power from the giving the chrism in confirmation.

I know no other objection, and these we see hinder not but that, —having such evidence of fact in scripture of confirmations done only by apostles, and this evidence urged by the fathers for the practice of the church, and the power of confirmation by many councils and fathers appropriated to bishops and denied to presbyters, and in this they are not only doctors teaching their own opinion, but witnesses of a catholic practice, and do actually attest it as done by a catholic consent, and no one example in all antiquity ever produced of any priest that did, no law that a priest might, impose hands for confirmation,—we may conclude it to be a power apostolical in the original, episcopal in the succession, and that in this power the order of a bishop is higher than that of a presbyter, and so declared by this instance of catholic practice.

§ 34. And jurisdiction.

Thus far I hope we are right. But I call to mind that in the *nosotrophium* of the old philosopher that undertook to cure all calentures by bathing his patients in water, some were up to the chin, some to the middle, some to the knees; so it is amongst the enemies of the sacred order of episcopacy; some

[b] [vid. p. 126, not. s.]
[c] [can. ii. tom. i. col. 1784.]
[d] Ep. i. Ad Decent. cap. 3. [p. 7.]
[e] [Gratian (dist. xcv. can. i., but see margin,) and S. Thomas Aquinas (part. iii. qu. 72. art. 11. § 1.) read 'baptizatos.' S. Gregory (ed. Ben.) has 'baptizandos;' but see the note.]

endure not the name, and they indeed deserve to be over head and ears; some will have them all one in office with presbyters, as at first they were in name, and they had need bathe up to the chin; but some stand shallower, and grant a little distinction, a precedency perhaps for order's sake, but no pre-eminence in reglement, no superiority of jurisdiction; others by all means would be thought to be quite thorough[e] in behalf of bishops' order and power, such as it is, but call for a reduction to the primitive state, and would have all bishops like the primitive; but because by this means they think to impair their power, they may well endure to be up to the ancles; their error indeed is less, and their pretence fairer, but the use they make of it of very ill consequence. But curing the mistake will quickly cure this distemper. That then shall be the present issue, that in the primitive church bishops had more power and greater exercise of absolute jurisdiction than now men will endure to be granted, or than themselves are very forward to challenge.

Which they expressed in attributes of authority and great power.

First then, the primitive church expressing the calling and offices of a bishop, did it in terms of presidency and authority. *Episcopus typum Dei Patris omnium gerit,* saith St. Ignatius[f], 'the bishop carries the representment of God the Father,' that is, in power and authority to be sure (for how else?) so as to be the supreme *in suo ordine,* in offices ecclesiastical. And again[g], *Quid enim aliud est episcopus quam is qui omni principatu et potestate superior est?* Here his superiority and advantage is expressed to be in his power; a bishop is greater and higher than all other in[h] power, viz., *in materia,* or *gradu religionis.* And in his epistle to the Magnesians[i], *Hortor ut hoc sit omnibus studium, in Dei concordia omnia agere, episcopo præsidente loco Dei,* 'do all things in unity, the bishop being president in the place of God;' president in all things. And with a fuller tide yet in his epistle to the church of Smyrna[j], *Honora episcopum ut principem sacerdotum imaginem Dei referentem, Dei quidem propter principatum, Christi vero propter sacerdotium;* it is full of fine expression both for eminency of order and jurisdiction; the bishop is 'the prince of the priests, bearing the image of God for his principality,' that's his jurisdiction and power; but 'of Christ himself for his priesthood;' that's his order. St. Ignatius hath spoken fairly; and if we consider that he was so primitive a man that himself saw Christ in the flesh, and lived a man of exemplary sanctity, and died a martyr, and hath been honoured as a holy catholic by all posterity, certainly these testimonies must needs be of great pressure, being *sententiæ repetiti dogmatis,* not casually slipped from him and by incogitancy, but resolutely and frequently.

But this is attested by the general expressions of after ages.

[e] ['through,' B, C.]
[f] Ep. [interp.] ad Trall. [§ 3. p. 61.]
[g] [§ 7. p. 63.]
[h] ['in' om. A.]
[i] [§ 6. p. 18.]
[j] [Interpol. § 9. p. 87.]

Fungeris circa eum potestate honoris tui, saith St. Cyprian[k] to bishop Rogatianus, 'execute the power of thy dignity' upon the refractary deacon; and *vigor episcopalis* and *auctoritas cathedræ* are the words expressive of that power, whatsoever it be, which St. Cyprian calls upon him to assert in the same epistle; this is high enough. So is that which he presently subjoins[l], calling the bishop's power *ecclesiæ gubernandæ sublimem ac divinam potestatem*, 'a high and a divine power and authority in regiment of the church.' *Locus magisterii traditus ab apostolis*, so St. Irenæus calls episcopacy[m], 'a place of mastership or authority delivered by the apostles to the bishops their successors.' Eusebius speaking of Dionysius who succeeded Heraclas, he received, saith he[n], τῆς προστασίας τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, 'the bishopric of the presidency over the churches of Alexandria:' εἰς τὴν ἀψῖδα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, saith the council of Sardis[o], 'to the top or height of episcopacy.' *Apices et principes omnium*, so Optatus[p] calls bishops, 'the chief and head of all;' and St. Denis of Alexandria *scribit ad Fabianum*[q] *urbis Romæ episcopum et ad alios quam plurimos ecclesiarum principes de fide catholica sua*, saith Eusebius[r]. And Origen[s] calls the bishop, *eum qui totius ecclesiæ arcem obtinet*, 'he that hath obtained the tower or height of the church.'

The fathers of the council of Constantinople *in Trullo*[t] ordained that the bishops,—dispossessed of their churches by encroachments of barbarous people upon the church's pale, so as the bishop had in effect no diocese,—yet they should enjoy τῇ τῆς προεδρίας αὐθεντίᾳ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον ὅρον, 'the authority of their presidency according to their proper state;' their appropriate presidency; and the same council calls the bishop τὸν τῆς πόλεως πρόεδρον, 'the prelate or prefect of the church;' I know not how to expound it better. But it is something more full in the Greeks' council of Carthage[u], commanding that the convert Donatists should be received according to the will and pleasure of the bishop, τοῦ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ κυβερνῶντος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, 'that governs the church in that place.' And in the council of Antioch[v], ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων ἐξουσίαν, 'the bishop hath power over the affairs of the church.' *Hoc . . tempore Romanæ quidem ecclesiæ Silvestrius retinacula gubernabat*, 'St. Sylvester' the bishop 'held the reins or the stern of the Roman church,' saith Theodoret[x].

[k] Lib. iii. epist. 9. [al. ep. iii. p. 5 sq.]
[l] [Ep. lix. p. 126.]
[m] [vid.] lib. iv. cap. 63. [al. cap. 33. § 8. p. 272.]
[n] [Τρίτον δὲ τούτῳ (sc. Φιλίππῳ Καίσαρι) ἔτος ἦν, καθ' ὃ μεταλλάξαντος Ἡρακλᾶ τὸν βίον ἐπὶ ἐκκαίδεκα ἔτεσι τῆς προστασίας, τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξανδρείαν ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Διονύσιος ὑπολαμβάνει.—Euseb. H. E. vi. 35.]
[o] [can. x. tom. i. col. 646.]
[p] Adv. Parmen. [lib. i. cap. 13. p. 14.]
[q] [al. 'Fabium.']
[r] [Hist. eccl. vi. 36.]
[s] Hom. vii. in Jerem. [al. hom. xi. § 3. tom. iii. p. 189 D.]
[t] [cap. xxxvii. tom. iii. col. 1676.]
[u] Can. lxix. [al. lxviii. tom. i. col. 901.]
[v] [can. xxv. tom. i. col. 603.]
[x] [Apud Cassiod.] Hist. tripart., lib. i. cap. 12. [p. 214.]

But the instances of this kind are infinite; two may be as good as twenty, and these they are.—The first is of St. Ambrose[y], *Honor et sublimitas episcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari*, 'the honour and sublimity of the episcopal order is beyond all comparison great:' and their commission he specifies to be in, *Pasce oves meas; unde quia regendæ sacerdotibus contraduntur, merito rectoribus suis subdi dicuntur, &c.*, 'the sheep are delivered to bishops as to rulers, and are made their subjects:' and in the next chapter[z], *Hæc vero cuncta, fratres, ideo nos præmisisse cognoscere debetis, ut ostenderemus nihil esse in hoc sæculo excellentius sacerdotibus, nihil sublimius episcopis reperiri; ut cum dignitatem episcopatus episcoporum oraculis demonstramus, et digne noscamus quid sumus, et quod sumus professione actione potius quam nomine demonstremus;* 'these things I have said that you may know nothing is higher, nothing more excellent than the dignity and eminence of a bishop,' &c.—The other is of St. Hierome[a], *Cura totius ecclesiæ ad episcopum pertinet*, 'the care of the whole church appertains to the bishop.' But more confidently spoken is that in his dialogue *adversus Luciferianos*[b], *Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet; cui si non exsors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes;* 'the safety of the church consists in the dignity of a bishop, to whom unless an eminent and unparalleled power be given by all, there will be as many schisms as priests.'

Here is dignity, and authority, and power enough expressed; and if words be expressive of things (and there is no other use of them), then the bishop is superior in a peerless and incomparable authority; and all the whole diocese are his subjects, viz., *in regimine spirituali.*

§ 35. Requiring universal obedience to be given to bishops by clergy and laity.

But from words let us pass to things. For the faith and practice of christendom requires obedience, universal obedience, to be given to bishops. I will begin again with Ignatius, that these men who call for reduction of episcopacy to primitive consistence may see what they gain by it; for the more primitive the testimonies are, the greater exaction of obedience to bishops. For it happened in this as in all other things, at first Christians were more devout, more pursuing of their duties, more zealous in attestation of every particle of their faith; and that episcopacy is now come to so low an ebb, it is nothing but that, it being a great part of christianity to honour and obey them, it hath the fate of all other parts of our religion, and particularly of charity, come to so low a declension as it can scarce stand alone; and faith, which shall scarce be found upon earth at the coming of the Son of man.

But to our business.—St. Ignatius in his epistle to the church of

[y] [De dign. sacerd., cap. ii. tom. ii. append. col. 359.]
[z] Cap. iii. [ibid.]
[a] [In Tit. i. 5. tom. iv. part. 1. col. 413.]
[b] [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 295.]

Trallis[c], *Necesse itaque est,* saith he, *quicquid facitis, ut sine episcopo nihil tentetis;* so the Latin of Vedelius, which I the rather choose[d] because I am willing to give all the advantage I can; 'it is necessary,' saith the good martyr, 'that whatsoever ye do, you should attempt nothing without your bishop.' And to the Magnesians[e], *Decet itaque vos obedire episcopo, et in nullo illi refragari,* 'it is fitting that ye should obey your bishop, and in nothing to be refractary to him.' Here is both a *decet* and a *necesse est* already; 'it is very fitting, it is necessary.' But if it be possible, we have a fuller expression yet in the same epistle[f]; *Quemadmodum enim Dominus sine Patre nihil facit, Nec enim possum* [*inquit*] *facere a meipso quicquam; sic et vos sine episcopo, nec presbyter nec diaconus, nec laicus; nec quicquam videatur vobis consentaneum quod sit præter illius judicium, quod enim tale est iniquum est et Deo inimicum.* Here is obedience universal both in respect of things and persons, and all this no less than absolutely necessary; 'for as Christ obeyed His Father in all things, saying, Of myself I can do nothing; so nor you without your bishop, whoever you be, whether priest, or deacon, or layman; let nothing please you which the bishop mislikes, for all such things are wicked and in enmity with God.' But it seems St. Ignatius was mightily in love with this precept, for he gives it to almost all the churches he writes to; we have already reckoned the Trallians and the Magnesians; but the same he gives to the priests of Tarsus[g], οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑποτάσσεσθε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, 'ye presbyters, be subject to your bishop;' the same to the Philadelphians[h], *Sine episcopo nihil facite,* 'do nothing without your bishop.' But this is better explicated in his epistle to the church of Smyrna[i], *Sine episcopo nemo quicquam faciat eorum quæ ad ecclesiam spectant,* 'no man may do any thing without the bishop,' viz., 'of those things which belong to the church.' So that this saying expounds all the rest, for this universal obedience is to be understood according to the sense of the church, viz., to be in all things of ecclesiastical cognizance, all church affairs. And therefore he gives a charge to St. Polycarp[k] their bishop, that he also look to it that nothing be done without his leave; *Nihil sine tuo arbitrio agatur, nec item tu quicquam præter Dei facies voluntatem;* 'as thou must do nothing against God's will, so let nothing' in the church 'be done without thine.' By the way observe, he says not that as the presbytery must do nothing without the bishop, so the bishop nothing without them; but, so the bishop nothing without God. But so it is: "nothing must be done without the bishop;" and therefore although he encourages them that can to remain in virginity, yet this if it be either done with pride or without the bishop, it is spoiled; for, *Si gloriatus*

[c] [§ 2. p. 22.]
[d] [Both here, and commonly. Ed.]
[e] [Interpol. § 3. p. 54.]
[f] [§ 7. p. 55.]
[g] [Supposit. § 8. p. 103.]
[h] [§ 7. p. 32.]
[i] [§ 8. p. 36.]
[k] [§ 4. p. 40.]

fuerit, periit, et si id ipsum statuatur sine episcopo, corruptum est. His last dictate in this epistle to St. Polycarp[l] is with an *Episcopo attendite sicut et Deus vobis,* 'the way to have God to take care of us is to observe our bishop.' *Hinc et vos decet accedere sententiæ episcopi, qui secundum Deum vos pascit; quemadmodum et facitis, edocti a Spiritu*[m]*;* 'you must therefore conform to the sentence of the bishop; as indeed ye do already, being taught so to do by God's Holy Spirit.'

There needs no more to be said in this cause, if the authority of so great a man will bear so great a burden. What the man was I said before; what these epistles are and of what authority, let it rest upon Vedelius[n], a man who is no wise to be suspected as a party for episcopacy; or rather upon the credit of Eusebius[o], St. Hierome[p], and Ruffinus[q], who reckon the first seven, out of which I have taken these *excerpta,* for natural and genuine[r]. And now I will make this use of it; Those men that call for reduction of episcopacy to the primitive state should do well to stand close to their principles, and count that the best episcopacy which is first; and then consider but what St. Ignatius hath told us for direction in this affair, and see what is gotten in the bargain. For my part, since they that call for such a reduction hope to gain by it, and then would most certainly have abidden by it, I think it not reasonable to abate any thing of Ignatius's height, but expect such subordination and conformity to the bishop, as he then knew to be a law of christianity. But let this be remembered all along, in the specification of the parts of their jurisdiction. But as yet I am in the general demonstration of obedience.

The council of Laodicea[s], having specified some particular instances of subordination and dependence to the bishop, sums them up thus: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου· 'so likewise the presbyters, let them do nothing without the precept and counsel of the bishop;' so is the translation of Isidore *ad verbum.* This council is ancient enough, for it was before the first Nicene. So also was that of Arles[t], commanding the same thing exactly, *ut presbyteri sine conscientia episcoporum nihil faciant. Sed nec presbyteris civitatis sine episcopi præcepto amplius aliquid*

[l] [§ 6. p. 41.]

[m] Ep. [interpol.] ad Ephes. [§ 4. p. 44.]

[n] Apologia pro Ignatio. [opp. S. Ign. præfix. 4to. Genev. 1623.]

[o] [Hist. eccles. iii. 36.]

[p] De scriptt. eccles. [in Ignatio, tom. iv. part. 2. col. 108.]

[q] Apud Euseb. quem latine reddidit. [p. 68.]

[r] [It may here be mentioned once for all, that Bp. Taylor sometimes quotes passages from St. Ignatius, as genuine, which are now regarded as spurious, or doubtful; but his argument is abundantly sufficient without them.]

[s] Can. lvii. [tom. i. col. 791.] Idem videre est apud Damasum, ep. [v.] De chorepiscopis. [Concil. Reg., tom. iii. p. 283 sqq.]

[t] Can. xix. [vid. can. xviii. tom. i. col. 266. 'De diaconibus urbicis, ut non sibi tantum præsumant, sed honorem presbyteris reservent, ut sine conscientia ipsorum nihil tale faciant.']

imperare, vel sine auctoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque parochia aliquid agere, says the thirteenth canon of the Ancyran council[u], according to the Latin of Isidore. The same thing is in the first council of Toledo[v], the very same words for which I cited the first council of Arles; viz., 'that presbyters do nothing without the knowledge or permission of the bishop.' *Esto subjectus pontifici tuo, et quasi animæ parentem suscipe*, it is the council of St. Hierome[x]; 'be subject to thy bishop, and receive him as the father of thy soul.'

I shall not need to derive hither any more particular instances of the duty and obedience owing from the laity to the bishop, for this account will certainly be admitted by all considering men. God hath intrusted the souls of the laity to the care of the ecclesiastical orders; they therefore are to submit to the government of the clergy in matters spiritual with which they are intrusted. For either there is no government at all, or the laity must govern the church, or else the clergy must. To say there is no government is to leave the church in worse condition than a tyranny. To say that the laity should govern the church when all ecclesiastical ministries are committed to the clergy, is to say scripture means not what it says; for it is to say that the clergy must be *præpositi*, and προεστῶτες, and *prælati*, and yet the prelation and presidency and rule is in them who are not ever by God's spirit called presidents or prelates, and that it is not in them who are called so. In the meantime, if the laity in matters spiritual are inferior to the clergy, and must in things pertaining to the soul be ruled by them with whom their souls are intrusted; then also much rather they must obey those of the clergy to whom all the other clergy themselves are bound to be obedient. Now since by the frequent precept of so many councils and fathers the deacons and presbyters must submit in all things to the bishop, much more must the laity; and since the bishop must rule in chief, and the presbyters at the most can but rule in conjunction and assistance, but ever in subordination to the bishop, the laity must obey *de integro;* for that is to keep them in that state in which God hath placed them.

But for the main, St. Clement in his epistle to St. James translated by Ruffinus[y], saith it was the doctrine of Peter, according to the institution of Christ, 'that presbyters should be obedient to their bishop in all things;' and in his third epistle[z], 'that presbyters and deacons, and others of the clergy, must take heed that they do nothing without the license of the bishop.' And to make this business up complete, all these authorities of great antiquity were not the prime constitutions in those several churches respectively, but mere derivations from tradition apostolical; for not only the thing, but the words so often mentioned, are in the fortieth[a] canon

[u] [tom. i. col. 276.]
[v] Can. xx. [tom. i. col. 992.]
[x] Epist. ad Nepotian. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 261.]
[y] [Coteler. Patr. apostol., tom. i. vid. §§ xiv. sqq. p. 619.]
[z] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. col. 119 fin.]
[a] [al. xxxii. p. 447.]

of the apostles; οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν, (the same is repeated in the twenty-fourth canon of the council of Antioch[b],) αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λόγον ἀπαιτηθησόμενος· 'presbyters and deacons must do nothing without leave of the bishop, for to him the Lord's people is committed, and he must give an account for their souls.' And if a presbyter shall contemn his own bishop, making conventions apart, and erecting another altar, he is to be deposed, ὡς φίλαρχος, saith the thirty-second[c] canon, 'as a lover of principality;' intimating that he arrogates episcopal dignity, and so is ambitious of a principality.

The issue then is this; the presbyters and clergy and laity must obey, therefore the bishop must govern and give them laws. It was particularly instanced in the case of St. Chrysostom, καὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν τούτοις κατεκόσμει τοῖς νόμοις, saith Theodoret[d]; 'he adorned and instructed Pontus with these laws;' so he, reckoning up the extent of his jurisdiction.

But now descend we to a specification of the power and jurisdiction of bishops.

§ 36. Appointing them to be judges of the clergy, and spiritual causes of the laity.

The bishops were ecclesiastical judges over the presbyters, the inferior clergy, and the laity. What they were in scripture who were constituted in presidency over causes spiritual, I have already twice explicated; and from hence it descended by a close succession that they who watched for souls, they had the rule over them, and because no regiment can be without coercion, therefore there was inherent in them a power of cognition of causes and coercion of persons. The canons of the apostles[e], appointing censures to be inflicted on delinquent persons, make the bishop's hand to do it; εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπου γένηται ἀφωρισμένος, τοῦτον μὴ ἐξεῖναι παρ' ἑτέρου δέχεσθαι[f], ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ τοῦ ἀφορίσαντος αὐτὸν, εἰ μὴ ἂν κατὰ συγκυρίαν τελευτήσῃ ὁ ἀφορίσας αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπος· 'if any presbyter or deacon be excommunicated by the bishop, he must not be received by any else but by him that did so censure him, unless the bishop that censured him be dead.' The same is repeated in the Nicene council[g]; only it is permitted that any one may appeal to a synod of bishops, *si forte aliqua indignatione aut contentione aut qualibet commotione episcopi sui excommunicati sint,* if he thinks himself wronged by prejudice or passion; and when the synod is met, *hujusmodi examinent quæstiones.* But by the way, it must be *synodus episcoporum,* so the canon; *ut ita demum hi qui ob culpas suas episcoporum suorum offensas merito contraxerunt, digne etiam a cæteris excommunicati . . habeantur, quousque in*

[b] [tom. i. col. 603.]
[c] [al. xxiv.]
[d] Lib. v. [cap. 28.]
[e] Can. xxxiii. [al. xxv. p. 446.]
[f] [al. δεχθῆναι.]
[g] Can. v. [tom. i. col. 325.]

communi vel ipsi episcopo suo visum fuerit humaniorem circa eos ferre sententiam; 'the synod of bishops must ratify the excommunication of all those who for their delinquencies have justly incurred the displeasure of their bishop, and this censure to stick upon them till either the synod or their own bishop shall give a more gentle sentence.' This canon we see relates to the canon of the apostles, and affixes the judicature of priests and deacons to the bishops, commanding their censures to be held as firm and valid; only as the apostles' canon names presbyters and deacons particularly, so the Nicene canon speaks indefinitely, and so comprehends all of the diocese and jurisdiction.

The fourth council of Carthage[g] gives in express terms the cognizance of clergy-causes to the bishop, calling aid from a synod in case a clergyman prove refractary and disobedient; *discordantes clericos episcopus vel ratione vel potestate ad concordiam trahat, inobedientes synodus per audientiam damnet;* 'if the bishop's reason will not end the controversies of clergymen, his power must; but if any man list to be contentious,' intimating (as I suppose out of the Nicene council) with frivolous appeals and impertinent protraction, 'the synod [of bishops] must condemn him,' viz., for his disobeying his bishop's sentence. The council of Antioch[h] is yet more particular in its sanction for this affair, intimating a clear distinction of proceeding in the causes[i] of a bishop, and the other of the priests and deacons; εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου καθαιρεθεὶς, ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, κ. τ. λ.; 'if a bishop shall be deposed by a synod,' (viz., of bishops, according to the exigence of the Nicene canon,) 'or a priest or deacon by his own bishop, if he meddles with any sacred offices he shall be hopeless of absolution.' But here we see that the ordinary judge of a bishop is a synod of bishops, but of priests and deacons the bishop alone: and the sentence of the bishop is made firm *omni modo* in the next canon, *si quis presbyter vel diaconus proprio contempto episcopo . . privatim congregationem effecerit et altare erexerit, et episcopo accersenti non obedierit, nec velit ei parere nec morem gerere primo et secundo vocanti, hic damnetur omni modo; quod si ecclesiam conturbare et solicitare persistat, tanquam seditiosus per potestates exteras opprimatur;* 'what presbyter soever refuses to obey his bishop, and will not appear at his first or second summons, let him be deposed, and if he shall persist to disturb the church, let him be given over to the secular powers.' Add to this the first[j] canon of the same council, εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου ἀκοινώνητος γέγονεν, κ. τ. λ., 'if any one be excommunicate by his own bishop,' &c., as it is in the foregoing canons of Nice and the apostles.—The result of these sanctions is this: the bishop is the judge, the bishop is to inflict censures; the

[g] Can. lix. [tom. i. col. 982.]
[h] Can. iv. [tom. i. col. 595.]
[i] ['cause,' B, C.]
[j] [Leg. 'sixth.']

presbyters and deacons are either to obey or to be deposed: no greater evidence in the world of a superior jurisdiction, and this established by all the power they had. And this did extend not only to the clergy but to the laity; for that's the close of the canon, *ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ὅρος ἐπὶ λαϊκῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ διακόνων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ κανόνι·* 'this constitution is concerning the laity, and the presbyters, and the deacons, and all that are within the rule,' viz., that if their bishop have sequestered them from the holy communion, they must not be suffered to communicate elsewhere.

But the *audientia episcopalis*, the 'bishop's audience-court,' is of larger power in the council of Chalcedon[j]: *εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω,* 'if any clergyman have any cause against a clergyman, let him by no means leave his own bishop and run to secular courts,' *ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἢ γοῦν γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπίσκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφότερα μέρη βούλεται, τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτείσθω,* 'but first let the cause be examined before their own bishop, or, by the bishop's leave, before such persons as the contesting parties shall desire;' *εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις,* 'whosoever does otherwise, let him suffer under the censures of the church.' Here is not only a subordination of the clergy in matters criminal, but also the civil causes of the clergy must be submitted to the bishop, under pain of the canon. I end this with the attestation of the council of Sardis[k], exactly of the same spirit, the same injunction, and almost the same words, with the former canons; Hosius the president said, 'If any deacon or priest or of the inferior clergy, being excommunicated, shall go to another bishop,' *γινώσκοντα ἀποκεκινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου,* 'knowing him to be excommunicated by his own bishop, that other bishop must by no means receive him into his communion.'

Thus far we have matter of public right and authority, declaring the bishop to be the ordinary judge of the causes and persons of clergymen, and have power of inflicting censures both upon the clergy and the laity. And if there be any weight in the concurrent testimony of the apostolical canons, of the general councils of Nice, and of Chalcedon, of the councils of Antioch, of Sardis, of Carthage; then it is evident that the bishop is the ordinary judge in all matters of spiritual cognizance, and hath power of censures, and therefore a superiority of jurisdiction.

This thing only by the way; in all these canons there is no mention made of any presbyters assistant with the bishop in his courts. For though I doubt not but the presbyters were in some churches and in some times *συνέδρευται* and *σύμβουλοι τῶν ἐπισκόπων*, as St. Ignatius[l] calls them, 'counsellors and assessors with the bishop;'

[j] Can. ix. [tom. ii. col. 605.]
[k] Can. xiii. et xiv. [Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 501.]
[l] [Ep. ad Trall., § 7. p. 63.]

yet the power and the right of inflicting censures is only expressed to be in the bishop, and no concurrent jurisdiction mentioned in the presbytery: but of this hereafter more particularly.

Now we may see these canons attested by practice and dogmatical resolution.

St. Cyprian is the man whom I would choose in all the world to depose in this cause; because he, if any man, hath given all dues to the college of presbyters; and yet if he reserves the superiority of jurisdiction to the bishop, and that absolutely, and independently of conjunction with the presbytery, we are all well enough, and without suspicion. *Diu patientiam meam tenui, fratres carissimi,* saith he[m], writing to the presbyters and deacons of his church; he was angry with them for admitting the *lapsi* without his consent, and though he was as willing as any man to comply both with the clergy and people of his diocese, yet he also must assert his own privileges and peculiar. *Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini, quando aliqui de presbyteris, nec evangelii nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini judicium, neque nunc sibi præpositum episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia et contemptu præpositi totum sibi vindicent.* The matter was that certain presbyters had reconciled them that fell in persecution without the performance of penance according to the severity of the canon; and this was done without the bishop's leave by the presbyters, 'forgetting their own place, and the gospel, and their bishop set over them, a thing that was never heard of till that time;' *totum sibi vindicabant,* they that might do nothing without the bishop's leave yet did this whole affair of their own heads. Well, upon this St. Cyprian himself by his own authority alone suspends them till his return, and so shews that his authority was independent, theirs was not, and then promises 'they shall have a fair hearing before him in the presence of the confessors and all the people;' *utar ea admonitione qua me uti Dominus jubet, ut interim prohibeantur offerre, acturi et apud nos et apud confessores ipsos et apud plebem universam causam suam*[n]. Here it is plain that St. Cyprian suspended these presbyters by his own authority in absence from his church, and reserved the further hearing of the cause till it should please God to restore him to his see.—But this fault of the presbyters St. Cyprian in the two next epistles does still more exaggerate, saying they ought to have asked the bishop's leave, *sicut in præteritum semper sub antecessoribus . . factum est*[o]; for so was the catholic custom ever, that nothing should be done without the bishop's leave, but now by doing otherwise they did prevaricate the divine commandment and dishonour the bishop. Yea, but the confessors interceded for the *lapsi,* and they seldom were discountenanced in their

[m] Epist. x. [al. xvi. p. 36.] [n] [p. 38.]
[o] Epist. xi. [al. xv. p. 33.]

requests; what should the presbyters do in this case? St. Cyprian tells them, writing to the confessors, *Petitiones itaque et desideria vestra episcopo servent*[p], 'let them keep your petitions for the bishop to consider of:' But they did not: therefore he suspended them, because they did not *reservare episcopo honorem sacerdotii sui et cathedræ*[q], 'preserve the honour of the bishop's chair and the episcopal authority,' in presuming to reconcile the penitents without the bishop's leave.—The same St. Cyprian[r] in his epistle to Rogatianus resolves this affair; for when a contemptuous bold deacon had abused his bishop, he complained to St. Cyprian who was an archbishop, and indeed St. Cyprian tells him he did honour him in the business, that he would complain to him, *cum pro episcopatus vigore et cathedræ auctoritate haberes potestatem qua posses de illo statim vindicari*, 'when as he had power episcopal and sufficient authority himself to have punished the deacon for his petulancy.' The whole epistle is very pertinent to this question, and is clear evidence for the great authority of episcopal jurisdiction, the sum whereof is in this encouragement given to Rogatianus by St. Cyprian, *Fungaris*[s] *circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel abstineas*, 'exercise the power of your honour upon him, and either suspend him or depose him.' And therefore he commends[t] Cornelius the bishop of Rome for driving Felicissimus the schismatic from the church, *vigore pleno quo episcopum agere oportet*, 'with full authority as becomes a bishop.'

Socrates[u], telling of the promotion and qualities of St. John Chrysostom, says that "in reforming the lives of the clergy he was too fastuous and severe." *Mox igitur in ipso initio quum clericis asper videretur ecclesiæ, erat plurimis odiosus, et veluti furiosum universi declinabant*, 'he was so rigid in animadversions against the clergy that he was hated by them;' which clearly shews that the bishop had jurisdiction and authority over them, for tyranny is the excess of power, and authority is the subject matter of rigour and austerity. But this power was intimated in that bold speech of his deacon Serapio[x], *Nunquam poteris, o episcope, hos corrigere, nisi uno baculo percusseris universos*, 'thou canst not amend the clergy unless thou strikest them all with thy pastoral rod.' St. John Chrysostom did not indeed do so; but *non post multum tempus plurimos clericorum pro diversis exemit causis*, 'he deprived and suspended most of the clergymen for divers causes;' and for this his severity he wanted no slanders against him, for the delinquent ministers set the people on work against him. But here we see that the power of censures was clearly and only in the bishop, for he was incited to have punished all his clergy, *universos*; and he did actually suspend

[p] [ibid., p. 34.]
[q] Epist. xii. [al. xvii. p. 39.]
[r] Epist. lxv. [al. iii. p. 5 sq.]
[s] [al. 'fungeris.']
[t] Epist. lv. [al. lix. p. 126.]
[u] [Apud Cassiod.] Tripart. hist., lib. x. cap. 3. [p. 354.]
[x] [ibid.]

most[y] of them, *plurimos*, and I think it will not be believed the presbytery of his church should join with their bishop to suspend themselves. Add to this that Theodoret[z] also affirms that Chrysostom entreated the priests to live canonically, according to the sanctions of the church, *quas quicunque prævaricari præsumerent, eos ad templum prohibebat accedere*, 'all them that transgressed the canons, he forbade them entrance into the church.'

Thus St. Hierome[a] to Riparius, *Miror sanctum episcopum in cujus parochia esse presbyter dicitur acquiescere furori ejus, et non virga apostolica virgaque ferrea confringere vas inutile, et tradere in interitum carnis ut spiritus salvus fiat;* 'I wonder,' saith he, 'that the holy bishop is not moved at the fury of Vigilantius, and does not break him with his apostolical rod, that by this temporary punishment his soul might be saved in the day of the Lord.' Hitherto the bishop's pastoral staff is of fair power and coercion.

The council of Aquileia[b] convoked against the Arians, is full and mighty in asserting the bishop's power over the laity, and did actually exercise censures upon the clergy; where St. Ambrose was the man that gave sentence against Palladius the Arian. Palladius would have declined the judgment of the bishops, for he saw he should certainly be condemned, and would fain have been judged by some honourable personages of the laity; but St. Ambrose said, *Sacerdotes de laicis judicare debent, non laici de sacerdotibus;* 'bishops must judge of the laity, not the laity of bishops.' That's for the *jus;* and for the *factum*, it was the shutting up of the council; St. Ambrose bishop of Milan gave sentence, *Pronuncio illum indignum sacerdotio, et carendum, et in loco ejus catholicus ordinetur.* The same also was the case of Marcellus[c] bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, whom for heresy the bishops at Constantinople deposed, Eusebius giving sentence, and chose Basilius in his room.

But their grandfather was served no better; Alexander bishop of Alexandria served him neither better nor worse. So Theodoret[d]; *Alexander autem, apostolicorum dogmatum prædicator, prius quidem eum revocare admonitionibus et consiliis nitebatur; cum vero eum superbire vidisset et aperte impietatis facinora prædicare, ex ordine sacerdotali removit,* 'the bishop first admonished the heretic, but when to his false doctrine he added pertinacy, he deprived him of the execution of his priestly function.'

This crime indeed deserved it highly: it was for a less matter that Triferius the bishop excommunicated Exuperantius a presbyter, viz., for a personal misdemeanor; and yet this censure was ratified by the

[y] [πολλούς, Socr. vi. 3. 'plurimos,' a good number.]

[z] [Apud Cassiod.] Tripart. hist., lib. x. cap. 4. [p. 355.]

[a] Advers. Vigilant. epist. liii. [al. xxxvii. ad Riparium, tom. iv. part. 2. col. 279.]

[b] [tom. i. col. 832 C.]

[c] [Cassiod.] Hist. tripart., lib. iii. cap. 9. [p. 241.]

[d] [Apud eund.] Hist. tripart., lib. i. cap. 12. [p. 214.]

council of Taurinum[e], and his restitution was left *arbitrio episcopi*, 'to the good will and pleasure of the bishop' who had censured him: *statuit quoque de Exuperantio presbytero sancta synodus, qui ad injuriam sancti episcopi sui Triferii gravia et multa congesserat, et frequentibus eum contumeliis provocaverat, propter quam causam ab eo fuerat dominica communione privatus, ut in ejus sit arbitrio restitutio ipsius in cujus potestate ejus fuit abjectio;* his restitution was therefore left in his power, because originally his censure was. The like was in the case of Palladius, a laic in the same council, *qui a Triferio sacerdote fuerat mulctatus,* 'who was punished by Triferius the bishop;' *hoc ei humanitate concilii reservato, ut ipse Triferius in potestate habeat quando voluerit ei relaxare.*

Here is the bishop censuring Palladius the laic, and excommunicating Exuperantius the priest, and this having been done by his own sole authority was ratified by the council, and the absolution reserved to the bishop too, which indeed was an act of favour; for they having complained to the council, by the council might have been absolved; but they were pleased to reserve to the bishop his own power.

These are particular instances, and made public by acts conciliary intervening: but it was the general canon and law of H. church.

Thus we have it expressed in the council of Agatha[f], *Contumaces vero clerici, prout dignitatis ordo permiserit, ab episcopis corrigantur,* 'refractary clerks must be punished by their bishops, according as the order of their dignity allows.'—I end this particular with some canons, commanding clerks to submit to the judgment and censures of their bishop under a canonical penalty: and so go on *ad alia.*

In the second council of Carthage[g], *Alypius*[h] *episcopus dixit, Nec illud prætermittendum est, ut si quis forte presbyter, ab episcopo suo correptus aut excommunicatus, tumore vel superbia inflatus putaverit separatim Deo sacrificia offerenda, vel aliud erigendum altare contra ecclesiasticam fidem disciplinamque crediderit, non exeat impunitus.* And the same is repeated in the Greek code of the African canons[i], 'If any presbyter, being excommunicated or otherwise punished by his bishop, shall not desist, but contest with his bishop, let him by no means go unpunished.'—The like is in the council of Chalcedon[k]; the words are the same that I before cited out of the canons of the council of Antioch, and of the apostles; but Carosus the archimandrite spake home in that action, Κάρωσος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιμανδρίτης εἶπε· τὴν τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ γενομένων πατέρων πίστιν, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐβαπτίσθην, οἶδα· ἐπεὶ ἐγὼ ἄλλην πίστιν οὐκ οἶδα· ἐπίσκοποί εἰσι, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι καὶ ἀφορίσαι καὶ καθαιρῆσαι, καὶ εἴ τι θέλουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι· πλείω ταύτης ἐγὼ

[e] Ann. Dom. 397. can. iv. [tom. i. col. 958.]
[f] Can. ii. [tom. ii. col. 998.]
[g] Can. viii. [tom. i. col. 952.]
[h] [The words are attributed, in the council to 'Felix episcopus Selemselitanus,' in the African code to Alypius.]
[i] Can. x. [tom. i. col. 871.]
[k] Act. iv. can. 83. [tom. ii. col. 433.]

ἄλλην οὐκ οἶδα[l]· 'the faith of the three hundred and eighteen fathers of the council of Nice, into which I was baptized, I know; other faith I know not: they are bishops; they have power to excommunicate and condemn, and they have power to do what they please: other faith than this I know none.' This is to purpose, and it was in one of the four great councils of christendom which all ages since have received with all veneration and devout estimate. —Another of them was that of Ephesus[m], convened against Nestorius, and this ratifies those acts of condemnation which the bishops had passed upon delinquent clerks; ὅσοι δὲ ἐπὶ ἀτοποις πράξεσι κατεκρίθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισκόπων, κ.τ.λ., 'they who are for their unworthy practices condemned by the synod, or by their own bishops,' although Nestorius did endeavour to restore them, yet their condemnation should still remain vigorous and confirmed. Upon which canon Balsamon[n] makes this observation, which indeed of itself is clear enough in the canon, Ἔμαθες ὅτι μητροπολῖται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι δύνανται κρίνειν τοὺς κληρικοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀφορισμῷ ἢ καὶ καθαιρέσει ἐστὶν ὅτε καθυποβάλλειν, 'hence you have learned that metropolitans and bishops can judge their clergy, and suspend them, and sometimes depose them.' Nay, they are bound to it; *pastoralis tamen necessitas habet (ne per plures serpant dira contagia) separare ab ovibus sanis morbidam,* 'it is necessary that the bishop should separate the scabbed sheep from the sound, lest their infection scatter;' so St. Austin[o].—And therefore the fourth council of Carthage commands[p], *ut episcopus accusatores fratrum excommunicet,* 'that the bishop excommunicate the accuser of their brethren,' (viz., such as bring clergy causes and catholic doctrine to be punished in secular tribunals;) for excommunication is called by the fathers, *mucro episcopalis,* the 'bishop's sword,' to cut offenders off from the catholic communion.—I add no more but that excellent saying of St. Austin[q], which doth freely attest both the preceptive and vindictive power of the bishop over his whole diocese, *Ergo, inquiunt, præcipiant tantummodo nobis quid facere debeamus qui nobis præsunt, et ut faciamus orent pro nobis; non autem nos corripiant et arguant, si non fecerimus. Imo omnia fiant, quoniam doctores ecclesiarum apostoli omnia faciebant, et præcipiebant quæ fierent et corripiebant si non fierent, &c.* And again[r], *Corripiantur itaque a præpositis suis subditi, . . correptionibus de caritate venientibus, pro culparum diversitate diversis, vel minoribus vel amplioribus, quia et ipsa quæ damnatio nominatur quam facit episcopale judicium, qua pœna in ecclesia nulla major est, potest si Deus voluerit in correptionem saluberrimam cedere atque proficere.* Here the bishops have

[l] Post epist. Archimandritarum ad Concilium pro Dioscori rehabilitatione. [Harduin. Concil., tom. ii. col. 428 B.]
[m] Can. v. [tom. i. col. 1624.]
[n] [Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 101.]
[o] [De corrept. et grat., cap. xv. tom. x. col. 775 F.]
[p] Can. lv. [tom. i. col. 982.]
[q] [Ubi supr. cap. iii. col. 752 B.]
[r] [Ut in not. o, supr.]

a power acknowledged in them to command their diocese and to punish the disobedient, and of excommunication by way of proper ministry, *damnatio quam facit episcopale judicium,* 'a condemnation of the bishop's infliction.'

Thus it is evident, by the constant practice of primitive christendom, by the canons of three general councils, and divers other provincial, which are made catholic by adoption and inserting them into the code of the catholic church, that the bishop was judge of his clergy and of the lay-people of his diocese; that he had power to inflict censures upon them in case of delinquency; that his censures were firm and valid: and as yet we find no presbyters joining either in commission or fact, in power or exercise; but excommunication and censures to be appropriated to bishops, and to be only despatched by them, either in full council if it was a bishop's cause, or in his own consistory if it was the cause of a priest, or the inferior clergy, or a laic; unless in cases of appeal, and then it was *in pleno concilio episcoporum,* in a synod of bishops: and all this was confirmed by secular authority, as appears in the imperial constitutions[s].

For the making up this paragraph complete, I must insert two considerations; first, concerning universality of Causes within the bishop's cognizance, and secondly of Persons.

I. The ancient canons, asserting the bishop's power *in cognitione causarum,* speak in most large and comprehensive terms; καὶ εἴ τι θέλωσιν ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι, 'they have power to do what they list,' their power is as large as their will; so the council of Chalcedon[t] before cited. It was no larger though than St. Paul's expression, "For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you whether ye be obedient in all things[u];" a large extent of power, when the apostles expected an universal obedience, ἐν πᾶσι. And so the style of the church runs in descension; ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράττειν ὑμᾶς, so Ignatius[v], 'ye must do nothing without your bishop;' καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτῷ ἀντιλέγειν, 'to contradict him in nothing;' the expression is frequent in him: καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν, 'to comprehend all things in his judgment or cognizance,' so the council of Antioch[x].

But these universal expressions must be understood *secundum materiam subjectam,* so St. Ignatius expresses himself; 'ye must without your bishop do nothing,' nothing τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν[y], 'of things pertaining to the church.' So also the council of Antioch[z], τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 'the things of the church,' are τοῦ

[s] Novell. const. cxxiii. cap. 11. [vid. capp. 10, 11, 21. tom. iii. col. 255 sqq.]

[t] [In canonn. passim.—Vid. etiam p. 141. not. k, supra.]

[u] [2 Cor. ii. 9.]

[v] [Ep. ad Trall. § 2. et ad Magnes. § 8. pp. 61, 54.]

[x] Can. ix. [tom. i. col. 597.]

[y] [Ad Smyrn. § 8. p. 36.]

[z] [can. xxiv. tom. i. col. 603.]

ἐπισκόπου τοῦ πεπιστευμένου πάντα τὸν λαὸν, 'committed to the bishop to whom all the people is intrusted.' They are ecclesiastical persons, it is an ecclesiastical power they are endowed with, it is for a spiritual end, viz., the regiment of the church and the good of souls, and therefore only those things which are in this order are of episcopal cognizance.

And what things are those?

1. First then, it is certain that since Christ hath professed His kingdom is not of this world, that government which He hath constituted *de novo* does no way in the world make any entrenchment upon the royalty.

> Hostis Herodes impie,
> Christum venire quid times?
> Non eripit mortalia,
> Qui regna dat cœlestia[a].

So the church used to sing. Whatsoever therefore the secular tribunal did take cognizance of before it was christian, the same it takes notice of after it is christened. And these are all actions civil, all public violations of justice, all breach of municipal laws: these the church hath nothing to do with, unless by the favour of princes and commonwealths it be indulged to them *in honorem Dei et S. matris ecclesiæ;* but then when it is once indulged, that act which does annul such pious vows is just contrary to that religion which first gave them; and then unless there was sin in the donative, the ablation of it is *contra honorem Dei et S. matris ecclesiæ.* But this, it may be, is impertinent.

2. The bishop's 'all' comes in after this; and he is judge of all those causes which christianity hath brought in upon a new stock, by its new distinctive principles. I say by its new principles; for there where it extends justice, and pursues the laws of nature, there the secular tribunal is also extended if it be christian; the bishop gets nothing of that: but those things which christianity, as it prescinds from the interest of the republic, hath introduced, all them, and all the causes emergent from them, the bishop is judge of. Such are causes of faith, ministration of sacraments, and sacramentals, subordination of inferior clergy to their superior, censures, irregularities, orders hierarchical, rites and ceremonies, liturgies and public forms of prayer, (as is famous in the ancient story[b] of Ignatius teaching his church the first use of antiphonas and doxologies, and thence was derived to all churches of christendom,) and all such things as are in immediate dependence of these, as dispensation of church-vessels, and ornaments, and goods, receiving and disposing the patrimony of the church, and whatsoever is of the same consideration, according to the forty-first[c] canon of the apostles, *Præcipimus ut in potestate sua episcopus ecclesiæ res habeat,* 'let the bishop have the disposing

[a] [Sedul. hymn., lin. 29. p. 374.]
[b] [Cassiod.] Tripart. hist., lib. x. cap. 9. [p. 357.]
[c] [al. xxxiv. p. 448.]

the goods of the church;' adding this reason, *Si enim animæ hominum pretiosæ illi sint creditæ, multo magis eum oportet curam pecuniarum gerere,* 'he that is intrusted with our precious souls, may much more be intrusted with the offertories of faithful people.'

3. There are some things of a mixed nature, and something of the secular interest and something of the ecclesiastical concur to their constitution, and these are of double cognizance; the secular power and the ecclesiastical do both in their several capacities take knowledge of them. Such are the delinquencies of clergymen, who are both clergy and subjects too, *clerus Domini* and *regis subditi;* and for their delinquencies which are *in materia justitiæ* the secular tribunal punishes, as being a violation of that right which the state must defend, but because done by a person who is a member of the sacred hierarchy, and hath also an obligation of special duty to his bishop, therefore the bishop also may punish him; and when the commonwealth hath inflicted a penalty, the bishop also may impose a censure, for every sin of a clergyman is two. But of this nature also are the convening of synods, the power whereof is in the king and in the bishop severally, insomuch as both the church and the commonwealth in their several respects have peculiar interest; the commonwealth for preservation of peace and charity, in which religion hath the deepest interest; and the church for the maintenance of faith. And therefore both prince and bishop have indicted synods in several ages, upon the exigence of several occasions, and have several powers for the engagement of clerical obedience and attendance upon such solemnities.

4. Because christianity is after the commonwealth, and is a capacity superadded to it, therefore those things which are of mixed cognizance are chiefly in the king; the supremacy here is his, and so it is in all things of this nature; which are called 'ecclesiastical,' because they are *in materia ecclesiæ, ad finem religionis,* but they are of a different nature and use from things 'spiritual,' because they are not issues of those things which christianity hath introduced *de integro,* and are separate from the interest of the commonwealth in its particular capacity, for such things only are properly spiritual.

5. The bishop's jurisdiction hath a compulsory derived from Christ only, viz., infliction of censures by excommunications, or other *minores plagæ,* which are in order to it. But yet this internal compulsory, through the duty of good princes to God and their favour to the church, is assisted by the secular arm, either superadding a temporal penalty in case of contumacy, or some other way abetting the censures of the church; and it ever was so since commonwealths were christian. So that ever since then episcopal jurisdiction hath a double part, an external and an internal; this is derived from Christ, that from the king; which because it is concurrent in all acts of jurisdiction, therefore it is that the king is supreme of the jurisdiction, viz., that part of it which is the external compulsory.

And for this cause we shall sometimes see the emperor, or his prefect, or any man of consular dignity, sit judge when the question is of faith; not that the prefect was to judge of that, or that the bishops were not; but in case of the pervicacy of a peevish heretic who would not submit to the power of the church but flew to the secular power for assistance, hoping by taking sanctuary there to engage the favour of the prince. In this case the bishops also appealed thither, not for resolution, but assistance, and sustentation of the church's power. It was so in the case of Aëtius the Arian[d] and Honoratus the prefect, Constantius being emperor: for all that the prefect did or the emperor in this case, was by the prevalency of his intervening authority to reconcile the disagreeing parties, and to encourage the catholics; but the precise act of judicature even in this case was in the bishops; for they deposed Aëtius for his heresy, for all his confident appeal; and Macedonius, Eleusius, Basilius, Ortasius, and Dracontius, for personal delinquencies. And all this is but to reconcile this act to the resolution and assertion of St. Ambrose[e], who refused to be tried in a cause of faith by lay judges, though delegates of the emperor. *Quando audisti, clementissime imperator, in causa fidei laicos de episcopo judicasse,* 'when was it ever known that laymen in a cause of faith did judge a bishop?' To be sure, it was not in the case of Honoratus the prefect; for if they had appealed to him, or to his master Constantius, for judgment of the article, and not for encouragement and secular assistance, St. Ambrose in his confident question of *Quando audisti?* had quickly been answered, even with saying, 'Presently after the council of Ariminum, in the case of Aëtius and Honoratus.' Nay, it was one of the causes why St. Ambrose deposed Palladius in the council of Aquileia, because he refused to answer except it were before some honourable personages of the laity. And it is observable that the Arians were the first (and indeed they offered at it often) that did desire princes to judge matters of faith; for they, despairing of their cause in a conciliary trial, hoped to engage the emperor on their party by making him umpire. But the catholic bishops made humble and fair remonstrance of the distinction of powers and jurisdictions; and as they might not entrench upon the royalty, so neither betray that right which Christ concredited to them to the encroachment of an exterior jurisdiction and power. It is a good story that Suidas[f] tells of Leontius bishop of Tripolis in Lydia, a man so famous and exemplary that he was called ὁ κάνων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 'the rule of the church,' that when Constantius the emperor did preside[g] amongst the bishops, and undertook to determine causes of mere spiritual cognizance, instead of a *placet*, he gave this answer, θαυμάζω, ἔφη, ὅπως ἕτερα διέπειν ταχθεὶς, ἑτέροις ἐπιχειρεῖς· στρατιωτικῶν μὲν καὶ πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων προεστηκὼς, ἐπισκόποις δὲ

[d] [Cassiod.] Tripart. hist., lib. v. cap. 35. [p. 274.]
[e] St. Ambrose, epist., lib. ii. epist. 13. [Ben. ep. xxi. § 4. tom. ii. col. 860 E.]
[f] In verbo Λεόντιος. [col. 2283 D.]
[g] ['precede,' B, C.]

περὶ τῶν εἰς μόνους ἐπισκόπους ἡκόντων διαταττόμενος· τὸν δὲ βασιλέα καταιδεσθέντα παύσασθαι τῆς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἤδη διακελεύσεως· 'I wonder that thou, being set over things of a different nature, meddlest with those things that only appertain to bishops; the *militia* and the *politia* are thine, but matters of faith and spirit are of episcopal cognizance:' *τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ Λεόντιος ἐλευθέριος,* 'such was the freedom of the ingenuous Leontius.' Answerable to which was that christian and fair acknowledgment of Valentinian[h] when the Arian[i] bishops of Bithynia and the Hellespont sent Hypatianus their legate to desire him *ut dignaretur ad emendationem dogmatis interesse,* 'that he would be pleased to mend the article;' *respondens Valentinianus ait, Mihi quidem, quum unus de populo sim, fas non est talia perscrutari, verum sacerdotes apud seipsos congregentur ubi voluerint; cumque hæc respondisset princeps, in Lampsacum convenerunt episcopi;* so Sozomen[h] reports the story. The emperor would not meddle with matters of faith, but referred the deliberation and decision of them to the bishops, to whom by God's law they did appertain; upon which intimation given the bishops convened in Lampsacum. And thus a double power met in the bishops; a divine right to decide the article, *Mihi fas non est,* saith the emperor, 'it is not lawful for me to meddle;' and then a right from the emperor to assemble, for he gave them leave to call a council. These are two distinct powers, one from Christ, the other from the prince.

And now upon this occasion I have fair opportunity to insert a consideration[j]. The bishops have power over all causes emergent in their dioceses, all I mean in the sense above explicated; they have power to inflict censures; excommunication is the highest, the rest are parts of it, and in order to it. Whether or no must church censures be used in all such causes as they take cognizance of, or may not the secular power find out some external compulsory instead of it, and forbid the church to use excommunication in certain cases?—To this I answer,

1. That if they be such cases in which by the law of Christ they may or such in which they must use excommunication, then in these cases no power can forbid them; for what power Christ hath given them, no man can take away.

2. As no human power can disrobe the church of the power of excommunication, so no human power can invest the church with a lay-compulsory. For if the church be not capable of a *jus gladii,* as most certainly she is not, the church cannot receive power to put men to death, or to inflict lesser pains in order to it, or any thing above a salutary penance, I mean in the formality of a church-tribunal; then they give the church what she must not, cannot take. I deny not but clergymen are as capable of the power of life and

[h] Tripart. hist., lib. vii. cap. 12. [p. 307.]

[i] [But see Valesius on Sozom. vi. 7.]

[j] [To understand the following paragraph see "Second Admonition to Parliament," p. 44 sqq.]

death as any man; but not in the formality of clergymen. A court of life and death cannot be an ecclesiastical tribunal; and then if any man or company of men should persuade the church not to inflict her censures upon delinquents in some cases in which she might lawfully inflict them, and pretend to give her another compulsory; they take away the church-consistory, and erect a very secular court, dependent on themselves, and by consequence to be appealed to from themselves, and so also to be prohibited as the lay-superior shall see cause for. Whoever therefore should be consenting to any such permutation of power is *traditor potestatis quam S. mater ecclesia a sponso suo acceperat,* 'he betrays the individual and inseparable right of holy church.' For her censures she may inflict upon her delinquent children without asking leave; Christ is her *αὐθεντία* for that, He is her warrant and security: the other is begged or borrowed, none of her own, nor of a fit edge to be used in her abscissions and coercions.

I end this consideration with that memorable canon of the apostles[j], of so frequent use in this question, *πάντων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐχέτω τὴν φροντίδα,* 'let the bishop have the care of provision for all affairs of the church, and let him dispense them *velut Deo contemplante,* as in the sight of God,' to whom he must be responsive for all his diocese.

II. The next consideration concerning the bishop's jurisdiction, is of what Persons he is judge? and because our scene lies here in church-practice, I shall only set down the doctrine of the primitive church in this affair, and leave it under that representation.

Presbyters, and deacons, and inferior clerks, and the laity, are already involved in the precedent canons; no man there was exempted of whose soul any bishop had charge. And all Christ's sheep hear His voice and the call of His shepherd-ministers. Theodoret[k] tells a story, that when the bishops of the province were assembled by the command of Valentinian the emperor for the choice of a successor to Auxentius in the see of Milan, the emperor wished them to be careful in the choice of a bishop, in these words, *τοιοῦτον δὴ οὖν καὶ νῦν τοῖς ἀρχιερατικοῖς ἐγκαθιδρύσατε θώκοις, ὅπως καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ τὴν βασιλείαν ἰθύνοντες εἰλικρινῶς αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωμεν κεφαλάς,* 'set such an one in the archiepiscopal throne, that we who rule the kingdom may sincerely submit our head unto him,' viz., in matters of spiritual import. And since all power is derived from Christ, who is a king and a priest and a prophet, christian kings are *Christi domini* and vicars in His regal power, but bishops in His sacerdotal and prophetical. So that the king hath a supreme regal power in causes of the church ever since his kingdom became christian, and it consists in all things in which the priestly office is not precisely by God's law employed for regiment

[j] Can. xxxix. [al. xxxi. p. 447.] [k] Hist. eccl., lib. iv. [cap. 5.]

and cure of souls, and in these also all the external compulsory and jurisdiction is[1] his own. For when his subjects became christian subjects, himself also upon the same terms becomes a christian ruler, and in both capacities he is to rule, viz., both as subjects and as christian subjects, except only in the precise issues of sacerdotal authority. And therefore the kingdom and the priesthood are excelled by each other in their several capacities. For superiority is usually expressed in three words, ὑπεροχὴ, ἀρχὴ, and ἐξουσία, 'excellency, impery, and power.' The king is supreme to the bishop in 'impery;' the bishop hath an 'excellency,' viz., of spiritual ministration, which Christ hath not concredited to the king; but in 'power,' both king and bishop have it distinctly in several capacities, the king *in potentia gladii*, the bishop *in potestate clavium;* the sword and the keys are the emblems of their distinct power. Something like this is in the third epistle of St. Clement[m], translated by Ruffinus, *Quid enim in præsenti sæculo propheta gloriosius, pontifice clarius, rege sublimius?* 'king, and priest, and prophet, are in their several excellencies the highest powers under heaven.' In this sense it is easy to understand those expressions often used in antiquity which might seem to make entrenchment upon the sacredness of royal prerogatives, were not both the piety and sense of the church sufficiently clear in the issues of her humblest obedience. And this is the sense of St. Ignatius[n], that holy martyr and disciple of the apostles, *Diaconi et reliquus clerus, una cum populo universo, militibus, principibus, et Cæsare, ipsi episcopo pareant,* 'let the deacons and all the clergy, and all the people, the soldiers, the princes, and Cæsar himself, obey the bishop.' This is it which St. Ambrose[o] said, *Sublimitas episcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari; si regum fulgori compares, et principum diademati, . . erit inferius, &c.* This also was acknowledged by the great Constantine[p], that most blessed prince, *Deus vos constituit sacerdotes, et potestatem vobis dedit de nobis quoque judicandi, et ideo nos a vobis recte judicamur; vos autem non potestis ab hominibus judicari,* viz., *sæcularibus,* and *in causis simplicis religionis;* so that good emperor in his oration to the Nicene fathers.

It was a famous contestation that St. Ambrose had with Auxentius the Arian, pretending the emperor's command to him to deliver up some certain churches in his diocese to the Arians: his answer was that palaces belonged to the emperor but churches to the bishop; and so they did by all the laws of christendom. The like was in the case of St. Athanasius and Constantius the emperor, exactly the same *per omnia,* as it is related by Ruffinus[q]. St. Ambrose sending his

[1] ['in,' A, B.]

[m] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 113.]

[n] Epist. [interpol.] ad Philadelph. [§ 4. p. 78.]

[o] De dign. sacerd., cap. ii. [tom. ii. append. col. 359 B.]

[p] Hist. eccl., lib. x. cap. 2. [Ruffin., p. 218.]

[q] Lib. x. eccles. hist., cap. 19. [p. 233.]

deacon to the emperor to desire him to go forth of the *cancelli* in his church at Milan, shews that then the powers were so distinct that they made no entrenchment upon each other. It was no greater power, but a more considerable act and higher exercise, the forbidding the communion to Theodosius[r] till he had by repentance washed out the blood that stuck upon him ever since the massacre at Thessalonica; it was a wonderful concurrence of piety in the emperor and resolution and authority in the bishop. But he was not the first that did it, for Philip the emperor was also guided by the pastoral rod and the severity of the bishop[s]. *De hoc traditum nobis est quod christianus fuerit, et in die paschæ, id est, in ipsis vigiliis, cum interesse voluisset et communicare mysteriis, ab episcopo loci non prius esse permissum nisi confiteretur peccata sua et inter pœnitentes staret, nec ullo modo copiam sibi mysteriorum futuram nisi prius per pœnitentiam culpas, quæ de eo ferebantur plurimæ, diluisset,* 'the bishop of the place would not let him communicate till he had washed away his sins by repentance:' and the emperor did so; *ferunt igitur libenter eum quod a sacerdote imperatum fuerat, suscepisse,* 'he did it willingly, undertaking the impositions laid upon him by the bishop.'

I doubt not but all the world believes the dispensation of the sacraments entirely to belong to ecclesiastical ministry. It was St. Chrysostom's[t] command to his presbyters to reject all wicked persons from the holy communion. "If he be a captain, a consul, or a crowned king, that cometh unworthily, forbid him and keep him off, thy power is greater than his; . . if thou darest not remove him, tell it me, I will not suffer it," &c. And had there never been more error in the managing church censures than in the foregoing instances, the church might have exercised censures and all the parts of power that Christ gave her, without either scandal or danger to herself or her penitents. But when in the very censure of excommunication there is a new ingredient put, a great proportion of secular inconveniences and human interest, when excommunications, as in the apostle's times they were deliverings over to Satan, so now shall be deliverings over to a foreign enemy or the people's rage; as then to be buffeted, so now to be deposed, or disinterest in the allegiance of subjects; in these cases excommunication being nothing like that which Christ authorized, and no way co-operating toward the end of its institution, but to an end of private designs and rebellious interest, bishops have no power of such censures, nor is it lawful to inflict them, things remaining in that consistence and capacity. And thus is that famous saying to be understood, reported by St. Thomas[u] to be St. Austin's, but is indeed found in the Ordi-

[r] Theodoret., lib. v. cap. 18. [al. 17. tom. iii. p. 1046.]

[s] Euseb., lib. vi. cap. 25. [Ruffino interpr., p. 150.]

[t] Hom. lxxxiii. [al. lxxxii. § 6.] in Matth. xxvi. [tom. vii. pp. 789 C, 790 B.]

[u] ['In aliquam universitatem sententia excommunicationis ferri potest. Sed contra est gloss. August. Matth. xiii.,

nary Gloss[v] upon Matt. xiii., *Princeps et multitudo non est excommunicanda*, 'a prince or a commonwealth are not to be excommunicate.'

Thus I have given a short account of the persons and causes of which bishops according to catholic practice did and might take cognizance. This use only I make of it. Although Christ hath given great authority to His church in order to the regiment of souls, such a power *quæ nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari*[x], yet it hath its limits, and a proper cognizance, viz., things spiritual, and the emergencies and consequents from those things which christianity hath introduced *de novo*, and superadded as things totally disparate from the precise interest of the commonwealth. And this I the rather noted, to shew how those men would mend themselves that cry down the tyranny, as they list to call it, of episcopacy, and yet call for the presbytery. For the presbytery does challenge cognizance of all causes whatsoever which are either sins directly or by reduction: 'all crimes which by the law of God deserve death[y];' there they bring in murders, treasons, witchcrafts, felonies: then the minor faults they bring in under the title of 'scandalous and offensive;' nay, *quodvis peccatum*, saith Snecanus[z]. To which if we add this consideration, that they believe 'every action of any man to have in it the malignity of a damnable sin,' there is nothing in the world, good or bad, vicious or suspicious, scandalous or criminal, true or imaginary, real actions or personal, in all which, and in all contestations and complaints, one party is delinquent, either by false accusation or real injury, but they comprehend in their vast gripe; and then they have power to nullify all courts and judicatories besides their own; and being for this their cognizance they pretend divine institution, there shall be no causes 'imperfect' in their consistory, no appeal from them, but they shall hear and determine with final resolution, and it will be sin, and therefore punishable, to complain of injustice and illegality. If this be confronted but with the pretences of episcopacy, and the modesty of their several demands and the reasonableness and divinity of each vindication examined, I suppose were there nothing but prudential motives to be put into the balance to weigh down this question, the cause would soon be deter-

quæ dicit quod princeps et multitudo non est excommunicanda.'—Aquin. In 3 partis supplem. q. xxii. art. 5. p. 30. fol. Col. Agr. 1604.]

[v] ['Multitudo non est excommunicanda, nec princeps populi.'—S. Aug. in Gloss. ordin. in Matth. xiii. 29.] Vid. Aug. ep. lxxv. [Ben. ccl. tom. ii. col. 878,] et Gratian. dist. xxiv. q. 2. c. 'Si habet.' [Qu. Caus. xxiv. q. 3. c. 1. 'Si habes,' col. 1541 sqq.] Sed ibi 'princeps' non inseritur, sed tantum in glossa ordinaria.

[x] [vid. p. 149. not. n, supra.]

[y] Vide the book of Order of Excommun. in Scotland, [Liturgy of Church of Scotland, edited by Cumming, 12mo. Lond. 1840, p. 123,] and the Hist. of Scotland. Admonit. 2. [viz. "Second Admonition to Parliament."] p. 46. Knox's Exhortation to England.

[z] ['Methodica descriptio,' &c. cap. De pecc. in Spir. sanct., p. 374. 8vo. Harl. 1591.]

mined; and the little finger of presbytery, not only in its exemplary and tried practices but in its dogmatical pretensions, is heavier than the loins, nay, than the whole body of episcopacy; but it seldom happens otherwise but that they who usurp a power prove tyrants in the execution, whereas the issues of a lawful power are fair and moderate.

§ 37. Forbidding presbyters to officiate without episcopal license.

But I must proceed to the more particular instances of episcopal jurisdiction. The whole power of ministration both of the word and sacraments was in the bishop by prime authority, and in the presbyters by commission and delegation, insomuch that they might not exercise any ordinary ministration without license from the bishop. They had power and capacity by their order to preach, to minister, to offer, to reconcile, and to baptize; they were indeed acts of order: but that they might not by the law of the church exercise any of these acts without license from the bishop, that is an act or issue of jurisdiction, and shews the superiority of the bishop over his presbyters by the practice of christendom.

St. Ignatius[a] hath done very good offices in all the parts of this question, and here also he brings in succour: *οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε προσφέρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν*, 'it is not lawful without the bishop,' viz., without his leave, 'either to baptize, or to offer sacrifice, or to make oblation, or to keep feasts of charity:' and a little before, speaking of the blessed eucharist and its ministration, and having premised a general interdict for doing any thing without the bishop's consent, *ἐκείνη δὲ βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ*· 'but let that eucharist,' saith he, 'be held valid, which is celebrated under the bishop, or under him to whom the bishop shall permit.'

I do not here dispute the matter of right, and whether or no the presbyters might *de jure* do any offices without episcopal license, but whether or no *de facto* it was permitted them in the primitive church? This is sufficient to shew to what issue the reduction of episcopacy to a primitive consistence will drive; and if I mistake not, it is at least a very probable determination of the question of right too. For who will imagine that bishops should at the first, in the calenture of their infant devotion, in the new spring of christianity, in the times of persecution, in all the public disadvantages of state and fortune, when they anchored only upon the shore of a holy conscience, that then they should have thoughts ambitious, encroaching, of usurpation and advantages, of purpose to divest their brethren of an authority intrusted them by Christ; and then too when all the advantage of their honour did only set them upon a hill, to feel a stronger blast of persecution, and was not, as since it hath been, attested with

[a] Epist. [interpol.] ad Smyrn. [§ 8. p. 86.]

secular assistance and fair arguments of honour, but was only in a mere spiritual estimate, and ten thousand real disadvantages. This will not be supposed either of wise or holy men. But however, *valeat quantum valere potest.* The question is now of matter of fact; and if the church of martyrs, and the church of saints and doctors and confessors, now regnant in heaven, be fair precedents for practices of christianity, we build upon a rock, though we had digged no deeper than this foundation of catholic practice.—Upon the hopes of these advantages, I proceed.

Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος καταφρονήσας τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου χωρὶς συναγωγὴν καὶ θυσιαστήριον πήξει, καθαιρείσθω[b]· 'if any presbyter, disrespecting his own bishop, shall make conventions apart, or erect an altar,' (viz., without the bishop's license) 'let him be deposed;' clearly intimating that *potestas faciendi concionem,* 'the power of making of church-meetings and assemblies' for preaching or other offices, is derived from the bishop; and therefore the canon adds, καθαιρείσθω ὡς φίλαρχος, τύραννος γάρ ἐστι· 'he is a lover of rule, he is a tyrant;' that is, an usurper of that power and government which belongs to the bishop. The same thing is also decreed in the council of Antioch[c], and in the council of Chalcedon[d]; πάντες οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν, οὗτος δίκαιος κάνων, οὗτος ὁ κάνων τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων· 'all the most reverend bishops cried out, This is a righteous law, this is the canon of the holy fathers;' this, viz., the canon apostolical now cited.

Tertullian[e] is something more particular, and instances in baptism; *Dandi baptismum jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax est; alioquin etiam laicis jus est.* The place is of great consideration, and carries in it its own objection and its answer. 'The bishop hath the right of giving baptism, then after him presbyters and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishop;' (so far the testimony is clear;) 'and this is for the honour of the church.' But does not this intimate it was only by positive constitution, and neither by divine nor apostolical ordinance? No indeed it does not; for it might be so ordained by Christ or His apostles *propter honorem ecclesiæ,* and no harm done; for it is honourable for the church that her ministrations should be most ordinate, and so they are when they descend from the superior to the subordinate. But the next words do of themselves make answer, 'otherwise laymen have right to baptize;' that is 'without the consent of the bishop laymen can do it as much as presbyters and deacons.' For indeed baptism conferred by laymen is valid and not to be repeated, but yet they ought not to administer it; so neither ought presbyters without the bishop's license; so says Tertullian, let

[b] Can. apost. xxxii. [al. xxiv. p. 446.]
[c] Can. v. [tom. i. col. 595.]
[d] Act. iv. [tom. ii. col. 433.—The exact words do not occur.]
[e] De baptism. [cap. xvii. p. 230.]

him answer it: only the difference is this, laymen cannot *jure ordinario* receive a leave or commission to make it lawful in them to baptize any; presbyters and deacons may, for their order is a capacity or possibility. But besides the sacrament of baptism, Tertullian[f] affirms the same of the venerable eucharist, *Eucharistiæ sacramentum non de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus;* the former place will expound this, if there be any scruple in *præsidentium*, for clearly the Christians receive the sacrament of the eucharist from none but bishops. I suppose he means 'without episcopal license;' whatsoever his meaning is, these are his words.

The council of Gangra[g], forbidding conventicles, expresses it with this intimation of episcopal authority, 'If any man shall make assemblies privately and out of the church, so despising the church, or shall do any church offices, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, without the presence of a priest by the decree of a bishop, let him be *anathema:*' the priest is not to be assistant at any meeting for private offices without the bishop's license; if they will celebrate *synaxes* privately, it must be by a priest, and he must be there by leave of the bishop, and then the assembly is lawful. And this thing was so known, that the fathers of the second council of Carthage[h] call it ignorance or hypocrisy in priests to do their offices without a license from the bishop; *Numidius episcopus Massilytanus*[i] *dixit, In quibusdam locis sunt presbyteri qui, aut ignorantes simpliciter, aut dissimulantes audacter, præsente et inconsulto episcopo, complurimis in domiciliis agant agenda, quod disciplinæ incongruum cognoscit esse sanctitas vestra;* 'in some places there are priests that in private houses do offices,' (houseling of people is the office meant, communicating them at home[k],) 'without the consent or leave of the bishop, being either simply ignorant or boldly dissembling;' implying that they could not else but know their duties to be, to procure episcopal license for their ministrations. *Ab universis episcopis dictum est, Quisquis presbyter inconsulto episcopo agenda in quolibet loco voluerit celebrare, ipse honori suo contrarius existit;* 'all the bishops said, If any priest without leave of his bishop shall celebrate the mysteries, be the place what it will be, he is an enemy to the bishop's dignity.'

After this in time, but before in authority, is the great council of Chalcedon[l]; οἱ κληρικοὶ . . ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἐπισκόπων τὴν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων παράδοσιν διαμενέτωσαν, 'let

[f] De corona mil., cap. iii. [p. 102 A.] Vide S. Chrysost. hom. xi. in 1 Tim.,—et S. Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. [e. g. coll. 292 et 302. tom. iv. part. 2.]

[g] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 535.]

[h] Can. ix. [tom. i. col. 953.]

[i] [al. 'Maxulitanus.']

[k] [—"at home."—Did the writer,—not always accurate in verbal scholarship,—mistake the origin of the expression before him? hurl, (Saxon) from *hunsl*, (Gothic) *hostia*, *hostiola*, (Latin) 'the host,'—hence, 'howsell, to minister the communion to one that lieth on his death-bed.' Cockeram.]

[l] Can. viii. part. 2. act. xiv. [al. act. xv. tom. ii. col. 603.]

the clergy, according to the tradition of the fathers, remain under the power of the bishops of the city;' so that they are, for their offices, in dependence of the authority of the bishop. The canon instances particularly to priests officiating in monasteries and hospitals, but extends itself to an indefinite expression, καὶ μὴ καταυθαδιάζεσθαι ἢ ἀφηνιᾷν τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, 'they must not dissent or differ from their bishop;' οἱ δὲ τολμῶντες ἀνατρέπειν τὴν τοιαύτην διατύπωσιν καθ' οἱονδήποτε τρόπον, κ.τ.λ. 'all they that transgress this constitution in any way, not submitting to their bishop, let them be punished canonically.' So that now these general expressions of obedience and subordination to the bishop being to be understood according to the exigence of the matter, to wit, the ministries of the clergy in their several offices, the canon extends its prohibition to all ministrations without the bishop's authority.

But it was more clearly and evidently law and practice in the Roman church; we have good witness for it, St. Leo[m] the bishop of that church is my author. *Sed neque coram episcopo licet presbyteris in baptisterium introire, nec præsente antistite infantem tingere aut signare, nec pœnitentem sine præceptione episcopi sui reconciliare, nec eo præsente, nisi illo jubente, sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi conficere, nec eo coram posito populum docere vel benedicere, &c.*, 'it is not lawful for the presbyters to enter into the baptistery, nor to baptize any catechumens, nor to consecrate the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, in the presence of the bishop, without his command.' From this place of St. Leo, if it be set in conjunction with the precedent, we have fair evidence of this whole particular. It is not lawful to do any offices without the bishop's leave; so St. Ignatius, so the canons of the apostles, so Tertullian, so the councils of Antioch and Chalcedon: it is not lawful to do any offices in the bishop's presence without leave, so St. Leo: the council of Carthage joins them both together, 'neither in his presence, nor without his leave in any place.'

Now against this practice of the church if any man should discourse as St. Hierome is pretended to do by Gratian[n], *Qui non vult presbyteros facere quæ jubentur a Deo, dicat quis major est Christo;* 'he that will not let presbyters do what they are commanded to do by God, let him tell us if any man be greater than Christ;' viz., whose command it is that presbyters should preach; why then did the church require the bishop's leave? might not presbyters do their duty without a license? This is it which the practice of the church is abundantly sufficient to answer: for to the bishop is committed the care of the whole diocese; he it is that must give the highest account for the whole charge; he it is who is appointed by peculiar designation to feed the flock; so the canon of the apostles[o], so Ignatius[p], so the council of Antioch[q], so everywhere; the presbyters are

[m] Epist. lxxxviii. [p. 159 A.]
[n] [Decret.] dist. xcv. cap. [6.] 'Ecce ego.' [col. 497.]
[o] Can. xl. [al. xxxii. p. 447.]
[p] Epist. ad Ephes. [§ 6. p. 13.]
[q] Can. xxiv. [tom. i. col. 603.]

admitted *in partem sollicitudinis*, but still the jurisdiction of the whole diocese is in the bishop; and without the bishop's admission to a part of it *per traditionem subditorum*, although the presbyter by his ordination have a capacity of preaching and administering sacraments, yet he cannot exercise this without designation of a particular charge, either temporary or fixed. And therefore it is that a presbyter may not do these acts without the bishop's leave, because they are actions of relation, and suppose a congregation to whom they must be administered, or some particular person; for a priest must not preach to the stones, as some say Venerable Bede[r] did; nor communicate alone, the word is destructive of the thing; nor baptize unless he have a chrisome child, or a catechumen. So that all of the diocese being the bishop's charge, the bishop must either authorize the priest, or the priest must not meddle, lest he be what St. Peter blamed, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, 'a bishop in another's diocese:' not that the bishop did license the acts precisely of baptizing, of consecrating, &c.; for these he had by his ordination; but that in giving license, he did give him a subject to whom he might apply these relative actions, and did *quoad hoc* take him *in partem sollicitudinis*, and concredit some part of his diocese to his administration *cum cura animarum*.

But then on the other side because the whole cure of the diocese is in the bishop, he cannot exonerate himself of it, for it is a burden of Christ's imposing, or it is not imposed at all; therefore this taking of presbyters into part of the regiment and care does not divest him of his own power or any part of it, nor yet ease him of his care, but that as he must still ἐπισκοπεῖν, 'visit' and 'see to' his diocese, so he hath authority still in all parts of his diocese; and this appears in these places now quoted, insomuch as when the bishop came to any place, there the *vicaria* of the presbyters did cease, *in præsentia majoris cessat potestas minoris*. And though because the bishop could not do all the minor and daily offices of the priesthood in every congregation of his diocese, therefore he appointed priests severally to officiate, himself looking to the metropolis and the daughter churches by a general supravision; yet when the bishop came into any place of his diocese, there he being present might do any office, because it was in his own charge, which he might concredit to another, but not exonerate himself of it; and therefore *præsente episcopo* (saith the council of Carthage and St. Leo[s]) 'if the bishop be present,' the presbyter without leave might not officiate; for he had no subjects of his own but by trust and delegation; and this delegation was given him to supply the bishop's absence, who could not *simul omnibus interesse*; but then where he was present, the cause of delegation ceasing, the jurisdiction also ceased, or was at least absorbed in the greater, and so without leave might not be exercised;

[r] [Petr. de Natal. in Mai. xxvii. lib. v. cap. 55.]
[s] [vid. nott. h, m, supra.]

like the stars, which in the noon-day have their own natural light as much as in the night, but appear not, shine not, in the presence of the sun.

This perhaps will seem uncouth to[t] those presbyters who (as the council of Carthage's expression is) are *contrarii honori episcopali;* but yet if we keep ourselves in our own form where God hath placed us and where we were in the primitive church, we shall find all this to be sooth, and full of order. For consider; the elder the prohibition was, the more absolute and indefinite it runs: 'without the bishop it is not lawful to baptize, to consecrate,' &c., so Ignatius; the prohibition is without limit: but in descent of the church it runs, *præsente episcopo,* 'the bishop being present,' they must not without leave. The thing is all one, and a derivation from the same original, to wit, the universality of the bishop's jurisdiction; but the reason of the difference of expression is this;—at first presbyters were in cities with the bishop, and no parishes at all concredited to them: the bishops lived in cities, the presbyters preached and offered κατ' οἶκον, 'from house to house,' according as the bishop directed them: here they had no ordinary charge, and therefore the first prohibitions run indefinitely, 'they must do any clerical offices *sine episcopo,* unless the bishop sends them.' But then afterwards, when the parishes were distinct and the presbyters fixed upon ordinary charges, then it was only *præsente episcopo,* 'if the bishop was present,' they might not officiate without leave. For in his absence they might do it, I do not say without leave, but I say they had leave given them when the bishop sent them to officiate in a village with ordinary or temporary residence, as it is to this day; when the bishop institutes to a particular charge, he also gives power *hoc ipso* of officiating in that place. So that at first when they did officiate in places by temporary missions, then they were to have leave, but this license was also temporary; but when they were fixed upon ordinary charges, they might not officiate without leave, but then they had an ordinary leave given them *in traditione subditorum,* and that was done *in subsidium muneris episcopalis,* because it was that part of the bishop's charge which he could not personally attend for execution of the minor offices, and therefore concredited it to a presbyter; but if he was present a new leave was necessary; because as the power always was in the bishop, so now the execution also did return to him when he was there in person; himself if he listed might officiate.

All this is excellently attested in the example of St. Austin, of whom Possidonius[u] in his life reports, that being but a presbyter, Valerius the bishop, being a Greek born, and not well spoken in the Latin tongue, and so unfit for public orations, *eidem presbytero* (viz., to Austin) *potestatem dedit coram se in ecclesia evangelium prædicandi ac frequentissime tractandi; contra usum quidem et consuetudinem Africanarum ecclesiarum,* 'he gave leave to Austin, then but

[t] ['in,' B, C.] [u] [Seu 'Possidius,' cap. v. col. 260.]

presbyter, to preach in the church even while himself was present; indeed against the use and custom of the African churches;' and for this act of his he suffered soundly in his report. For the case was thus; in all Africa ever since the first spring of the Arian heresy the church had then suffered so much by the preaching of Arius the presbyter, that they made a law not to suffer any presbyter to preach at all, at least in the mother church and in the bishop's presence; τοῦτο ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ἀφ' οὗ Ἄρειος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐτάραξε, saith Socrates[x], 'thence came this custom in the African churches.' But because Valerius saw St. Austin so able, and himself for want of Latin so unfit, he gave leave to Austin to preach before him, against the custom of the African churches; but he adds this reason for his excuse too, it was not indeed the custom of Africa, but it was of the Oriental churches: for so Possidonius proceeds, *Sed et ille vir venerabilis ac providus in orientalibus ecclesiis id ex more fieri sciens;* in the Levant it was usual for bishops to give presbyters leave to preach, *dummodo factitaretur a presbytero quod a se episcopo impleri minime posse cernebat.* Which determines us fully in the business: for this leave to do offices was but there to be given 'where the bishop himself could not fulfil the offices;' which shews the presbyters in their several charges, whether of temporary mission or fixed residence to be but delegates and vicars of the bishop, admitted *in partem sollicitudinis,* to assist the bishop in his great charge of the whole diocese.

Against this it is objected out of St. Hierome[y], and it is recorded by Gratian, *Ecce ego dico præsentibus episcopis suis atque adstantibus in altari presbyteros posse sacramenta conficere,* 'behold I say that presbyters may minister sacraments in presence of the bishop;' so Gratian quotes it indeed, but St. Hierome says the express contrary, unless we all have false copies, for in St. Hierome it is not *ecce ego dico,* but *nec ego dico;* he does not say it is lawful for presbyters to officiate in the presence of their bishop. Indeed St. Hierome is angry at Rusticus bishop of Narbona because he would not give leave to presbyters to preach, nor to bless, &c.; this perhaps it was not well done, but this makes not against the former discourse; for though it may be fit for the bishop to give leave, the church requiring it still more and more in descent of ages and multiplication of christians and parishes, yet it is clear that this is not to be done without the bishop's leave; for it is for this very thing that St. Hierome disputes against Rusticus, to shew he did amiss, because he would not give his presbyters license. And this he also reprehends in his epistle *ad Nepotianum*[z], *Pessimæ consuetudinis est in quibusdam ecclesiis tacere presbyteros et præsentibus episcopis non loqui,* 'that presbyters might not be suffered to preach in presence of the bishop, that was an ill custom;' to wit, as things then stood: and it was mended presently

[x] Lib. v. [cap. 22.]
[y] Ad Rustic. Narbon. [apud Gratian. dist. xcv. can. 'Ecce ego.' [col. 497.]]
[z] [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 262.]

after, for presbyters did preach in the bishop's presence, but it was by license from their ordinary; for so Possidonius[a] relates, that upon this act of Valerius before mentioned, *postea currente et volante hujusmodi fama, bono præcedente exemplo, accepta ab episcopis potestate presbyteri nonnulli coram episcopis populis tractare cœperunt verbum Dei,* 'by occasion of this precedent it came to pass that some presbyters did preach to the people in the bishop's presence, having first obtained faculty from the bishop so to do:' and a little after it became a custom, from a general faculty and dispensation indulged to them in the second council of Vase[b]. Now if this evidence of church-practice be not sufficient to reconcile us to St. Hierome, let him then first be reconciled to himself and then we are sure to be helped: for in his dialogue against the Luciferians[c] his words are these, *Cui si non exsors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot efficientur schismata quot sunt sacerdotes; inde venit ut sine episcopi missione neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeat baptizandi:* 'because the bishop hath an eminent power, and this power is necessary; thence it comes that neither presbyter nor deacon may so much as baptize without the bishop's leave.'

This whole discourse shews clearly not only the bishops to be superior in jurisdiction, but that they have sole jurisdiction, and the presbyters only in substitution and vicaridge.

§ 38. Reserving church-goods to episcopal dispensation.

Divers other acts there are to attest the superiority of the bishop's jurisdiction over priests and deacons, as that all the goods of the church were in the bishop's sole disposing; and as at first they were laid at the apostles' feet, so afterwards at the bishop's. So it is in the forty-first canon of the apostles[d]; so it is in the council of Gangra[e]: and all the world are excluded from intervening in the dispensation without express delegation from the bishop, as appears in the seventh and eighth canons, and that under pain of an *anathema* by the holy council. And therefore when in success of time some patrons that had founded churches and endowed them thought that the dispensation of those lands did not belong to the bishop, of this the third council of Toledo[f] complains, and makes remedy, commanding *ut omnia secundum constitutionem antiquam ad episcopi ordinationem et potestatem pertineant.* The same is renewed in the fourth council of Toledo[g], *Noverint autem conditores basilicarum in rebus quas eisdem ecclesiis conferunt nullam se potestatem habere, sed juxta canonum instituta sicut ecclesiam, ita et dotem ejus ad ordinationem episcopi pertinere.* These councils I produce not as judges but as witnesses in the business; for they give concurrent testimony, that 'as the

[a] [In vit. August., cap. v.]
[b] Can. ii. [tom. ii. col. 1105.]
[c] [vid. p. 131. not. b, supr.]
[d] [al. xxxiv. p. 448.]
[e] [can. vii. sq. tom. i. p. 535.]
[f] An. Dom. 589. [can. xix. tom. iii. col. 483.]
[g] Can. xxxiii. [tom. iii. col. 587.]

church itself, so the dowry of it too did belong to the bishop's disposition by the ancient canons.' For so the third council of Toledo calls it, *antiquam constitutionem*, and itself is almost eleven hundred years old; so that still I am precisely within the bounds of the primitive church, though it be taken in a narrow sense. For so it was determined in the great council of Chalcedon[h], commanding that the goods of the church should be dispensed by a clergy steward, κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, 'according to the pleasure or sentence of the bishop.'

§ 89. Forbidding presbyters to leave their own diocese or to travel without leave of the bishop.

Add to this that without the bishop's dimissory letters presbyters might not go to another diocese. So it is decreed in the fifteenth canon of the apostles, under pain of suspension or deposition; μηκέτι λειτουργεῖν is the censure; and that especially εἰ προσκαλουμένου αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου αὐτοῦ ἐπανελθεῖν οὐκ ὑπήκουσεν, 'if he would not return when his bishop calls him.' The same is renewed in the council of Antioch, cap. iii.[i], and in the council of Constantinople *in Trullo*, cap. xvii.[j]; the censure there is, καθαιρεῖσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, 'let him be deposed that shall without dimissory letters from the bishop ἐν ἑτέρᾳ κατατάττεσθαι ἐκκλησίᾳ, fix himself in the diocese of another bishop:' but with license of his bishop he may; *sacerdotes vel alii clerici concessione suorum episcoporum possunt ad alias ecclesias transmigrare.* But this is frequently renewed in many other synodal decrees[k]; these may suffice for this instance.

But this not leaving the diocese is not only meant of promotion in another church, but clergymen might not travel from city to city without the bishop's license; which is not only an argument of his regiment *in genere politico*, but extends it almost to a despotic; but so strict was the primitive church in preserving the strict tie of duty and clerical subordination to their bishop. The council of Laodicea[l] commands a priest or clergyman ἄνευ κανονικῶν γραμμάτων μὴ ὁδεύειν, 'not to travel without canonical or dimissory letters;' and who are to grant these letters is expressed in the next canon, which repeats the same prohibition, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικὸν ἢ κληρικὸν ἄνευ κελεύσεως ἐπισκόπου ὁδεύειν, 'a priest or a clerk must not travel without the command of his bishop;' and this prohibition is inserted into the body of the law, *De consecrat.* dist. v. can. '*Non oportet*[m],'

[h] Can. xxvi. [tom. ii. p. 611 D.]—Vide Zonaram in hunc canonem [p. 117.]—Videatur Concil. Carthag. Græc. can. xxxvi. xxxviii. et xli. et Balsam. ibid. [which reference should be, Concil. Carthag. Græc. can. xxxvi. et Balsam. ibid. (See Bevereg., Synod. tom. i. p. 560.) et can. apostol. xxxviii. et xli.—It will be seen, on referring to the passage of Balsamon, how the mistake arose.] et Just. Mart. apol. ii. [al. Apol. i. § 67. p. 84 A.]

[i] [tom. i. col. 593.]

[j] [tom. iii. col. 1668.]

[k] Vide Concil. Epaun. can. v. et Venet. can. x. [leg. v. tom. ii. coll. 1048 et 797.]

[l] Can. xli. [tom. i. col. 789.]

[m] [Gratian. Decret. col. 2235.]

which puts in the clause of *Neque etiam laicum;* but this was beyond the council. The same is in the council of Agatha[n]. The council of Venice[o] adds a censure, that those clerks should be like persons excommunicate in all those places whither they went without letters of license from their bishop. The same penalty is inflicted by the council of Epaunum[p], *Presbytero vel diacono sine antistitis sui epistolis ambulanti communionem nullus impendat.* The first council of Touraine[q] in France, and the third council of Orleans[r], attest the self-same power in the bishop and duty in all his clergy.

§ 40. And the bishop had power to prefer which of his clerks he pleased.

But a coercitive authority makes not a complete jurisdiction unless it be also remunerative; and "the princes of the nations are called εὐεργέται, benefactors[s];" for it is but half a tie to endear obedience when the subject only fears *quod prodesse non poterit,* 'that which cannot profit.' And therefore the primitive church, to make the episcopal jurisdiction up entire, gave power to the bishop to present the clerks of his diocese to the higher orders and nearer degrees of approximation to himself; and the clerks might not refuse to be so promoted. *Item placuit ut quicunque clerici vel diaconi pro necessitatibus ecclesiarum non obtemperaverint episcopis suis volentibus eos ad honorem ampliorem in sua ecclesia promovere, nec illic ministrent in gradu suo unde recedere noluerunt,* so it is decreed in the African code[t], 'they that will not by their bishop be promoted to a greater honour in the church, must not enjoy what they have already.'

But it is a question of great consideration and worth a strict enquiry, in whom the right and power of electing clerks was resident in the primitive church: for the right and the power did not always go together, and also several orders had several manners[u] of election; presbyters and inferior clergy were chosen by the bishop alone; the bishop by a synod of bishops, or by their chapter; and lastly, because of late strong outcries are made upon several pretensions, amongst which the people make the biggest noise, though of all, their title to election of clerks be most empty; therefore let us consider it upon all its grounds.

1. In the Acts of the Apostles[v], which are most certainly the best precedents for all acts of holy church, we find that "Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in every church," and "they passed through Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, and Derbe," χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, 'appointing them elders.' St. Paul chose Timothy bishop of Ephesus; and he says[w] of himself and Titus, "For this cause I sent thee to Crete," ἵνα καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους,

[n] Can. xxxviii. [tom. ii. col. 1002.]
[o] Can. v. [tom. ii. col. 797.]
[p] Can. vi. [tom. ii. col. 1048.]
[q] [can. xi. tom. ii. col. 795.]
[r] [can. xv. tom. ii. col. 1426.]
[s] [Luke xxii. 25.]
[t] Can. xxxi. [tom. i. col. 879.]
[u] ['manner,' A.]
[v] [chap. xiv. 23.]
[w] [Tit. i. 5.]

'that thou shouldest appoint presbyters or bishops' (be they which they will) 'in every city.' The word καταστήσῃς signifies that the whole action was his: for that he ordained them, no man questions; but he also appointed them, and that was, saith St. Paul, ὡς ἐγώ σοι διεταξάμην, 'as I commanded thee:' it was therefore an apostolical ordinance that the bishop should appoint presbyters. Let there be half so much shewn for the people, and I will also endeavour to promote their interest.—There is only one pretence of a popular election in scripture; it is of the seven that were set over the widows. But first, this was no part of the hierarchy: this was no cure of souls: this was no divine institution: it was in the dispensation of moneys: it was by command of the apostles the election was made, and they might recede from their own right: it was to satisfy the multitude: it was to avoid scandal, which in the dispensation of moneys might easily arise: it was in a temporary office: it was with such limitations and conditions as the apostles prescribed them: it was out of the number of the seventy that the election was made, if we may believe St. Epiphanius[x], so that they were presbyters before this choice: and lastly, it was only a nomination of seven men; the determination of the business, and the authority of rejection was still in the apostles, and indeed the whole power, "whom we may appoint over this business:" and after all this there can be no hurt done by the objection, especially since clearly and indubiously the election of bishops and presbyters was in the apostles' own persons: ὃς πρῶτος ἐνεχείρισθη παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ὑμετέραν προστασίαν, saith St. Ignatius[y] of Evodias, 'Evodias was first appointed to be your governor or bishop by the apostles;' and themselves did commit it to others that were bishops, as in the instances before reckoned. Thus the case stood in scripture.

2. In the practice of the church it went according to the same law and practice apostolical; the people did not, might not, choose the ministers of holy church. So the council of Laodicea[z], περὶ τοῦ μὴ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖον, 'the people must not choose those that are to be promoted to the priesthood.' The prohibition extends to their non-election of all the superior clergy, bishops, and presbyters. But who then must elect them? The council of Nice determines that; for in the sixteenth and seventeenth canons[a] the council forbids any promotion of clerks to be made but by the bishop of that church where they are first ordained; which clearly reserves to the bishop the power of retaining or promoting all his clergy.

3. All ordinations were made by bishops alone, as I have already proved. Now let this be confronted with the practice of primitive christendom, that no presbyter might be ordained *sine titulo*, 'with-

[x] [Hær. xx. § 4. p. 50 C.]
[y] Epist. [supposit.] ad Antioch. [cap. vii. tom. ii. p. 106.]
[z] Can. xiii. [tom. i. col. 783.]
[a] [can. xvi. Gr., xvi. et xvii. secund. vers. Isidori, tom. i. col. 332.]

out a particular charge,' which was always custom, and at last grew to be a law in the council of Chalcedon[b], and we shall perceive that the ordainer was the only chooser; for then to ordain a presbyter was also to give him a charge; and the patronage of a church was not a lay inheritance, but part of the bishop's cure, for he had *φροντὶδα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν πόλει καὶ χώρᾳ*, 'the care of the churches in all the diocese;' as I have already shewn. And therefore when St. Hierome[c] according to the custom of christendom had specified some particular ordinations or election of presbyters by bishops, as how himself was made priest by Paulinus, and Paulinus[d] by Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Gaudeat episcopus judicio suo cum tales Christo elegerit sacerdotes;* 'let the bishop rejoice in his own act, having chosen such worthy priests for the service of Christ.'

Thus St. Ambrose[e] gives intimation that the dispensing all the offices in the clergy was solely in the bishop: *hæc . . spectet sacerdos, et quid cuique congruat, id officii deputet,* 'let the bishop observe these rules, and appoint every one his office as is best answerable to his condition and capacity.' And Theodoret[f] reports of Leontius the bishop of Antioch, how being an Arian, *adversarios recti dogmatis suscipiens, licet turpem habentes vitam, ad presbyteratus tamen ordinem et diaconatus evexit, eos autem qui universis virtutibus ornabantur et apostolica dogmata defendebant absque honore deseruit,* 'he advanced his own faction, but would not promote any man that was catholic and pious.' So he did; the power therefore of clerical promotion was in his own hands. This thing is evident and notorious; and there is scarce any example in antiquity of either presbyters or people choosing any priest, but only in the case of St. Austin, whom the people's haste snatched and carried him to their bishop Valerius, entreating him to ordain him priest. This indeed is true, that the testimony of the people for the life of them that were to be ordained was by St. Cyprian[g] ordinarily required; *in ordinandis*[h] *clericis, fratres carissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare;* 'it was his custom to advise with his people concerning the public fame of clerks to be ordained;' it was usual, I say, with him, but not perpetual; for it was otherwise in the case of Celerinus and divers others, as I shewed elsewhere.

4. In election of bishops, though not of priests, the clergy and the people had a greater actual interest, and did often intervene with their silent consenting suffrages or public acclamations. But first, this was not necessary; it was otherwise among the apostles,

[b] [can. vi. tom. ii. col. 603.]
[c] Ep. lxi. et lxii. [al. xxxviii. et xxxix.] et ad Nepotian. [tom. iv. part. 2. coll. 333, 336, 262.]
[d] [Leg. 'Paulinianus.' Paulinus was ordained by Lucifer, Socr., H. E. iii. 6. Theodoret., H. E. iii. 5.]
[e] De off. min., lib. i. cap. 44. [tom. ii. col. 57 E.]
[f] [Apud Cassiod.] Hist. tripart., lib. v. cap. 32. [p. 271.]
[g] [Ep. xxxviii. p. 74.]
[h] [al. 'ordinationibus.']

and in the case of Timothy, of Titus, of St. James, of St. Mark, and all the successors, whom they did constitute in the several chairs[i]: secondly, this was not by law or right, but in fact only; it was against the canon of the Laodicean council[j], and the thirty-first canon of the apostles[k], which under pain of deposition commands that a bishop be not promoted to his church by the intervening of any lay power.

Against this discourse St. Cyprian[l] is strongly pretended. *Quando ipsa [plebs] maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi, quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, &c.;* thus he is usually cited, 'the people have power to choose or to refuse their bishops, and this comes to them from divine authority.' No such matter: the following words expound him better; *quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur,* 'that the bishop is chosen publicly in the presence of the people, and he only be thought fit who is approved by public judgment and testimony;' or as St. Paul's phrase is, 'he must have a good report of all men:' that is indeed a divine institution; and that to this purpose and for the public attestation of the act of election and ordination the people's presence was required, appears clearly by St. Cyprian's discourse in this epistle. For what is the divine authority that he mentions? It is only the example of Moses, whom God commanded to take the son of Eleazar, and clothe him with his father's robes *coram omni synagoga,* 'before all the congregation.' The people chose not; God chose Eleazar, and Moses consecrated him, and the people stood and looked on; that's all that this argument can supply. Just thus bishops are and ever were ordained, *non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia,* 'in the sight of the people standing by:' but to what end? *Ut plebe præsente detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita prædicentur.* All this while the election is not in the people, nothing but the public testimony and examination; for so it follows, *Et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quæ omnium suffragio et judicio fuerit examinata.*

But St. Cyprian hath two more proofs whence we may learn either the sense or the truth of his assertion. The one is of the apostle's ordaining the seven deacons, but this we have already examined: the other of St. Peter choosing St. Matthias into the apostolate; it was indeed done in the presence of the people. But here it is considerable, 1) That at this surrogation of St. Matthias, the number of the persons present was but one hundred and twenty, of which eleven were apostles, and seventy-two were disciples and presbyters; they make up eighty-three, and then there remains but thirty-seven of the

[i] ['charges,' C.]
[j] [can. xii. sq. tom. i. col. 783.]
[k] [al. xxiii. p. 446.]
[l] Ep. lxviii. [al. lxvii. p. 171.]

laity, of which many were women, which I know not yet whether any man would admit to the election of an apostle, and whether they do or do not, the laity is a very inconsiderable number, if the matter had been to be carried by plurality of voices; so that let the worst come that is imaginable, the whole business was in effect carried by the clergy, whom in this case we have no reason to suspect to be divided, and of a distinct or disagreeing interest. 2) Let this discourse be of what validity it will, yet all this whole business was miraculous and extraordinary; for though the apostles named two candidates, yet the Holy Ghost chose them by particular revelation. And yet for all this it was lawful for St. Peter alone to have done it without casting lots. *An non licebat ipsi* [*Petro*] *eligere? Licebat, et quidem maxime; verum id non facit ne cui videretur gratificari; quanquam alioqui non erat particeps Spiritus:* 'for all he had not as yet received the Holy Ghost, yet he had power himself to have completed the election;' so St. Chrysostom[m].

So that now if St. Cyprian means more than the presence of the people for suffrage of public testimony, and extends it to a suffrage of formal choice, his proofs of the divine authority are invalid; there is no such thing can be deduced from thence; and then this his complying so much with the people, which hath been the fault of many a good man, may be reckoned together with his rebaptization. But truth is, he means no more than suffrage of testimony, viz., that he who is to be chosen bishop be for his good life a man of good fame, and approved of before God and all the people; and this is all the share they have in their election. And so indeed himself sums up the whole business, and tells us of another *jus divinum* too[n], *Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina et apostolica observatione observandum est et tenendum, quod apud nos quoque et fere apud provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes ritè celebrandas ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, et episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit;* 'it is most diligently to be observed, for there is a divine tradition and an apostolical ordinance for it, and it is used by us and almost by all churches, that all the bishops of the province assemble to the making of right ordinations, and that a bishop be chosen in the face of the people, who best know their life and conversation.' So that the bishops were to make the formal election, the people to give their judgment of approbation in this particular, and so much as concerned the exemplary piety and good life of him that was to be their bishop. Here we see in St. Cyprian is a *jus divinum* for the bishop's choosing a colleague or a brother-bishop, as much as for the presence of the people, and yet the presence was all. And howsoever the people were present to give this testimony, yet the election was clearly in the bishops, and that by

[m] Hom. iii. in Act. [interpr. Front. Ducæo, tom. viii. p. 469 D.]
[n] [ubi supra, not. l, p. 172.]

divine tradition and apostolical observation, saith St. Cyprian; and thus it was in all churches almost.

In Africa this was, and so it continued till after St. Austin's[o] time, particularly in the choice of Eradius[p], his successor; it was so in the Greek church, as St. Chrysostom[q] tells us; it was so in Spain, as St. Isidore[r] tells us; and in many other places, that the people should be present and give acclamation and tumultuary approbation, but to the formal election of the clergy made by enumeration of votes and subscription the people never were admitted.

5. Although that in times of persecution, at first, and to comply with the people, who were in all respects to be sweetened to make them with easier appetite swallow the bitter pill of persecution, and also to make them more obedient to their bishop if they did, though but in a tumult and noise, cry him up in his ordination, *Ne plebs invita episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit, et fiat minus religiosa quam convenit, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit,* for so St. Leo[s] expresses the cause; yet the formality and right of proper election was in the clergy, and often so practised without any consent at all or intervening act of the people. The right, I say, was in the bishops; so it was decreed in the Nicene council[t], ἐπίσκοπον προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι, 'the bishop must be appointed or constituted by all the bishops of the province,' τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων δίδοσθαι καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ, 'it must be confirmed and established by the metropolitan;' no presbyters here all this while, no people. But the exercise of this power is more clearly seen in the acts of some councils, where the fathers degraded some bishops, and themselves appointed others in their rooms. The bishops in the council of Constantinople deposed Marcellus, *in cujus locum Basilium in Ancyram miserunt,* 'they sent Basilius bishop in his room,' saith Sozomen[u]. *Ostendat Bassianus si per synodum reverendissimorum episcoporum, et consueta lege episcopus Ephesiorum metropolis est constitutus,* said the fathers of the council of Chalcedon[x], 'let Bassianus shew that he was made bishop of Ephesus by a synod of bishops and according to the accustomed law.' The law I shewed before, even the Nicene canon; the fathers of which council sent a synodal epistle[y] to the church of Alexandria, to tell them they had deposed Melitius from the office of a bishop, only left him the name, but 'took from him all power;' *nullam vero omnimodo habere potestatem, neque eligendi, neque ordinandi, &c.,* neither suffering him to 'choose' nor to 'ordain' clerks. It seems then that was part of the episcopal office in ordi-

[o] Epist. cxx. [leg. cx. al. ccxiii. tom. ii. col. 788 sqq.]
[p] [al. 'Eraclius.']
[q] De sacerd., lib. iii. [§ 15. tom. i. p. 392 sqq.]
[r] De offic., lib. ii. [cap. 5. § 7. tom. v. p. 419.]
[s] Epist. lxxxiv. cap. 5. [p. 154 C.]
[t] Can. iv. [tom. i. col. 323.]
[u] [Leg. 'Socrates,' apud Cassiod.] hist. tripart., lib. iii. c. 9. [p. 241.]
[x] Act. xi. [vid. tom. ii. col. 552 D.]
[y] [Cassiod.] hist. tripart., lib. ii. c. 12. [p. 229.]

nary, *placitos sibi eligere*, as the epistle expresses it in the sequel, 'to choose whom they listed;' but the council deposed Melitius and sent Alexander their bishop and patriarch to rule the church again. And particularly to come home to the case of the present question, when Auxentius[z] bishop of Milan was dead, and the bishops of the province, and the clergy of the church, and the people of the city, were assembled at the choosing of another, the emperor makes a speech to the bishops only that they should be careful in their choice; so that although the people were present, *quibus pro fide et religione etiam honor deferendus est*, as St. Cyprian's[a] phrase is, 'to whom respect is to be had, and fair complyings to be used, so long as they are pious, catholic, and obedient,' yet both the right of electing and solemnity of ordaining was in the bishops; the people's interest did not arrive to one half of this.

6. There are in antiquity divers precedents of bishops who chose their own successors; it will not be imagined the people will choose a bishop over his head, and proclaim that they were weary of him: in those days they had more piety. Agelius[b] did so, he chose Sisinnius; and that it may appear it was without the people, they came about him and entreated him to choose Marcian, to whom they had been beholden in the time of Valens the emperor; he complied with them and appointed Marcian to be his successor, and Sisinnius, whom he had first chosen, to succeed Marcian. Thus did Valerius choose his successor St. Austin; for though the people named him for their priest, and carried him to Valerius to take orders, yet Valerius chose him bishop. And this was usual; ὡς καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις, as Epiphanius[c] expresses this case; it was ordinary to do so in many churches.

7. The manner of election in many churches was various; for although indeed the church had commanded it, and given power to the bishops to make the election, yet in some times and in some churches the presbyters or the chapter choose one out of themselves: St. Hierome[d] says they always did so in Alexandria, from St. Mark's time to Heraclas and Dionysius: St. Ambrose[e] says that at the first the bishop was not by a formal new election promoted, but *recedente uno sequens ei succedebat*, 'as one died, so the next senior did succeed him;' in both these cases no mixture of the people's votes.

8. In the church of England the people were never admitted to the choice of a bishop from its first becoming Christian to this very day; and therefore to take it from the clergy in whom it always was by permission of princes, and to interest the people in it, is to recede *a traditionibus majorum*, 'from the religion of our forefathers,' and to innovate in a high proportion.

[z] Theodoret., lib. iv. [cap. 5.]
[a] [vid. ep. xix. p. 42.]
[b] Socr., lib. v. [cap. 21.]
[c] [vid. hær. lxviii. § 6.]
[d] [Epist. ci. ad Evang. (al. lxxxv. ad Evagr.) tom. iv. part. 2. col. 803.]
[e] [vid.] in Eph. iv. [ver. 12. tom. ii. append. col. 241 F.]

9. In those churches where the people's suffrage (by way of testimony I mean and approbation) did concur with the synod of bishops in the choice of a bishop, the people at last according to their usual guise grew hot, angry, and tumultuous; and then were engaged by divisions in religion to name a bishop of their own sect, and to disgrace one another by public scandal and contestation, and often grew up to sedition and murder; and therefore although they were never admitted (unless where themselves usurped) further than I have declared, yet even this was taken from them; especially since in tumultuary assemblies they were apt to carry all before them, they knew not how to distinguish between power and right, they had not well learned to take denial; but began to obtrude whom they listed, to swell higher like a torrent when they were checked; and the soleship of election which by the ancient canons was in the bishops, they would have asserted wholly to themselves, both in right and execution.

I end this with the annotation of Zonaras[f] upon the twelfth canon of the Laodicean council, *Populi suffragiis olim episcopi eligebantur*, (understand him in the senses above explicated,) *sed cum multæ inde seditiones existerent, hinc factum est ut episcoporum uniuscujusque provinciæ auctoritate eligi episcopum quemque oportere decreverint patres*[g]; 'of old time bishops were chosen not without the suffrage of the people' (for they concurred by way of testimony and acclamation) 'but when this occasioned many seditions and tumults, the fathers decreed that a bishop should be chosen by the authority of the bishops of the province.' And he adds that in the election of Damasus a hundred and thirty-seven men were slain, and that six hundred examples more of that nature were producible.

Truth is, the nomination of bishops in scripture was in the apostles alone; and though the kindred of our blessed Saviour were admitted to the choice of Simeon Cleophæ, the successor of St. James, to the bishopric of Jerusalem, as Eusebius[h] witnesses, it was *propter singularem honorem*, 'an honorary and extraordinary privilege' indulged to them for their vicinity and relation to our blessed Lord, the fountain of all benison to us; and for that very reason Simeon himself was chosen bishop too. Yet this was *præter regulam apostolicam*; the rule of the apostles and their precedents were for the sole right of the bishops to choose their colleagues in that sacred order. And then in descent, even before the Nicene council the people were forbidden to meddle in election, for they had no authority by scripture to choose; by the necessity of times, and for the reasons before asserted, they were admitted to such a share of the choice as is now folded up in a piece of paper, even to a testimonial; and yet I deny not but they did often take more, as in the case of Nilamnion, *quem*

[f] [p. 344.] [g] [deest 'patres.']

[h] Hist. eccles., lib. iii [cap. 11.]

cives elegerunt, saith the story out of Sozomen[i], they chose him alone, (though God took away his life before himself would accept of their choice;) and then they behaved themselves oftentimes with so much insolency, partiality, faction, sedition, cruelty, and pagan baseness, that they were quite interdicted it above twelve hundred[k] years agone[l]. So that they had their little in possession but a little while, and never had any due; and therefore now their request for it is no petition of right, but a popular ambition, and a snatching at a sword to hew the church in pieces.

But I think I need not have troubled myself half so far, for they that strive to introduce a popular election would as fain have episcopacy out as popularity of election let in; so that all this of popular election of bishops may seem superfluous. For I consider that if the people's power of choosing bishops be founded upon God's law, as some men pretend from St. Cyprian, (not proving the thing from God's law but God's law from St. Cyprian,) then bishops themselves must be by God's law, for surely God never gave them power to choose any man into that office which Himself hath no way instituted. And therefore I suppose these men will desist from their pretence of divine right of popular election, if the church will recede from her divine right of episcopacy. But for all their plundering and confounding, their bold pretences have made this discourse necessary.

§ 41. Bishops only did vote in councils, and neither presbyters nor people.

If we add to all these foregoing particulars the power of making laws to be in bishops, nothing else can be required to the making up of a spiritual principality. Now as I have shewn that the bishop of every diocese did give laws to his own church for particulars, so it is evident that the laws of provinces and of the catholic church were made by conventions of bishops, without the intervening or concurrence of presbyters or any else for sentence and decision.

The instances of this are just so many as there are councils. St. Athanasius[m] reprehending Constantius the Arian for interposing in the conciliary determinations of faith, *Si judicium episcoporum est*, saith he, *quid cum eo commune habet imperator?* 'It is a judgment to be passed by bishops,' (meaning the determination of the article,) 'and not proper for the emperor.' And when Hosius of Corduba[n] reproved him for sitting president in a council, *Quis enim videns eum in decernendo principem se facere episcoporum . . non merito dicat illum eam ipsam abominationem desolationis?* 'he that sits president

[i] [Apud Cassiod.] Tripart. hist., lib. x. cap. 14. [p. 359.]

[k] [Written A.D. 1642.]

[l] Vide Gratian. dist. lxiii. per tot. [col. 341 sqq.]

[m] Epist. ad Solitar. [interpr. Nannio, fol. ex officin. Commelin. 1601.—Ben. 'Historia Arianorum ad monachos.' § 52. tom. i. p. 376 A.]

[n] [Rather, Athanasius himself, as above, § 77. p. 390 E.]

makes himself chief of the bishops,' &c., intimating bishops only to preside in councils, and to make decision.—And therefore *conventus episcoporum* and *concilium episcoporum* are the words for general and provincial councils. *Bis in anno episcoporum concilia celebrentur*, said the thirty-eighth[o] canon of the apostles; and *congregatio episcopalis* the council of Sardis is called by Theodoret[p]; and when the question was started in the time of pope Victor about the celebration of Easter, *Ob quam causam*, saith Eusebius[q], *conventus episcoporum et concilia per singulas quasque provincias convocantur*. Where by the way it is[r] observable that at first even provincial synods were only held by bishops, and presbyters had no interest in the decision; however we have of late sat so near bishops in provincial assemblies that we have sat upon the bishop's skirts.

But my lords the bishops have a concerning interest in this: to them I leave it; and because the four general councils are the precedents and chief of all the rest, I shall only instance in them for this particular.

1. The title of the Nicene council[s] runs thus, Κανόνες τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων, 'the canons of the three hundred and eighteen fathers met in Nice.' These fathers were all that gave suffrage to the canons, for if they had been more, the title could not have appropriated the sanction to three hundred and eighteen. And that there were no more St. Ambrose[t] gives testimony, in that he makes it to be a mystical number; *Nam et Abraham trecentos decem et octo duxit ad bellum: de conciliis id potissimum sequor, quod trecenti decem et octo sacerdotes velut tropæum extulerunt, ut mihi videatur hoc esse divinum, quod eodem numero in conciliis fidei habemus oraculum, quo in historia pietatis exemplum.* Well, three hundred and eighteen was the number of the judges, the Nicene fathers; and they were all bishops, for so is the title of the subscriptions[u], *Subscripserunt trecenti decem et octo episcopi qui in eodem concilio convenerunt;* thirteen whereof were *chorepiscopi*, but not one presbyter; save only that Vitus and Vincentius subscribed as legates of the bishop of Rome, but not by their own authority.

2. The great council of Constantinople was celebrated by one hundred and fifty bishops; κανόνες τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνελθόντων, that's the title of the canons[x], 'the canon of a hundred and fifty holy fathers who met in C. P.:' and that these were all bishops appears by the title of St. Gregory Nazianzen's[y] oration in the beginning of the council, τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζιανζήνου συντακτήριος εἰς τὴν τῶν ἑκατὸν

[o] [al. xxx. p. 447.]
[p] [lib. ii. cap. 7.]
[q] Lib. v. cap. 23. [Ruffin. interpr., p. 122.]
[r] ['it is to be,' A.]
[s] [Mansi, concil., tom. ii. col. 668.]
[t] Procem. in lib. De fide. [tom. ii. col. 444 A.]
[u] [Bin. concil., tom. i. p. 281.]
[x] [Mansi, concil., tom. iii. col. 557.]
[y] [Apud Binium, concil., tom. i. p. 523.]

πεντήκοντα ἐπισκόπων παρουσίαν, 'the oration of St. Gregory Nazianzen in the presence of a hundred and fifty bishops.' And of this council it was that Socrates[z] speaking, *Imperator*, saith he, *nulla mora interposita concilium episcoporum convocat.* Here indeed some few bishops appeared by proxy, as Montanus bishop of Claudiopolis by Paulus a presbyter, and Atarbius bishop of Pontus by Cylus a reader, and about some four or five more. This only, amongst the subscriptions I find Tyrannus, Auxanon, Helladius, and Elpidius, calling themselves presbyters: but their modesty hinders not the truth of the former testimonies; they were bishops, saith the title of the council, and the oration, and the canons, and Socrates; and lest there be scruple concerning Auxanon *presbyter Apameæ,* because before Johannes Apameensis subscribed, which seems to intimate that one of them was the bishop and the other but a presbyter indeed, without a subterfuge of modesty, the titles distinguish them; for John was bishop in the province of Cæle Syria, and Auxanon of Apamea in Pisidia.

3. The third was the council of Ephesus, *episcoporum plurium quam ducentorum*[a], as it is often said in the acts of the council, 'of above two hundred bishops,' but no presbyters; for *cum episcopi supra ducentos extiterint qui Nestorium deposuerunt, horum subscriptionibus contenti fuimus,* 'we were content with the subscription of the two hundred and odd bishops,' saith the council[b]; and Theodosius junior in his epistle to the synod[c], *Illicitum est,* saith he, *eum qui non sit in ordine sanctissimorum episcoporum ecclesiasticis immisceri tractatibus,* 'it is unlawful for any but them who are in the order of the most holy bishops to be interested in ecclesiastical assemblies.'

4. The last of the four great conventions of christendom was *sexcentorum triginta episcoporum,* 'of six hundred and thirty bishops,' at Chalcedon[d] in Bithynia. But in all these assemblies no mere presbyter gave suffrage, except by legation from his bishop and delegation of authority. And therefore when in this council some laics and some monks, and some clergymen not bishops, would interest themselves, Pulcheria[e] the empress sent letters to Consularius to repel them by force, *Si præter nostram evocationem, aut permissionem suorum episcoporum, ibidem commorantur,* 'who come without command of the empress, or the bishop's permission.' Where it is observable that the bishops might bring clerks with them to assist, to dispute, and to be present in all the action; and thus they often did suffer abbots or archimandrites to be there, and to subscribe too; but that was *præter regulam,* and by indulgence only and condescension; for when Martinus the abbot was requested to subscribe, he answered, *non suum esse sed episcoporum tantum subscribere,* 'it belonged only

[z] Lib. v. [cap. 8.]
[a] [tom. i. col. 1432, et passim.]
[b] Epist. synod. ad clerum C. Ptanum. part. ii. act. 3. [tom. i. col. 1483.]
[c] Part. i. c. 32. [al. cap. xxxv. Bin., xx. Harduin., tom. i. col. 1346.]
[d] [tom. ii. init.]
[e] [ibid., col. 48.]

to bishops to subscribe to councils.' For this reason, the fathers themselves often called out in the council[f], *Mitte foras superfluos, concilium episcoporum est.*

But I need not more particular arguments, for till the council of Basil the church never admitted presbyters as in their own right to voice in councils, and that council we know savoured too much of the schismatic; but before this council no example, no precedent of subscriptions of the presbyters, either to œcumenical or provincial synods. Indeed to a diocesan synod, viz., that of Auxerre in Burgundy, I find thirty-two presbyters subscribing. This synod was neither œcumenical nor provincial, but merely the convocation of a diocese; for here was but one bishop, and some few abbots, and thirty-two presbyters. It was indeed no more than a visitation or the calling of a chapter, for of this we receive intimation in the seventh canon[g] of that assembly; *Ut medio Maio omnes presbyteri ad synodum . . venirent,* that was their summons; *et in Novembri*[h] *omnes abbates ad concilium:* so that here is intimation of a yearly synod besides the first convention, the greatest of them but diocesan, and therefore the lesser but *conventus capitularis,* or however, not enough to give evidence of a subscription of presbyters to so much as a provincial council, for the guise of christendom was always otherwise. And therefore it was the best argument[i] that the bishops in the Arian hurry used to acquit themselves from the suspicion of heresy, *Neque nos sumus Arii sectatores, qui namque fieri potest ut cum simus episcopi Ario presbytero auscultemus?* Bishops never receive determination of any article from priests, but priests do from bishops: *nam vestrum est eos instruere,* saith St. Clement[j], speaking of the bishop's office and power over priests and all the clergy and all the diocese, *eorum est vobis obedire, ut Deo cujus legatione fungimini;* and a little after[k], *audire ergo eum attentius oportet et ab ipso suscipere doctrinam fidei, monita autem vitæ a presbyteris inquirere,* 'of the priests we must enquire for rules of good life, but of the bishop receive positions and determinations of faith.'

Against this if it be objected, *Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari debet,* 'that which is of general concernment must also be of general scrutiny;' I answer, it is true, unless where God himself hath intrusted the care of others in a body, as He hath in the bishops, and will require the souls of his diocese at his hand, and commanded us to require the law at their mouths[l], and to follow their faith[m] whom He hath set over us. And therefore the determination of councils pertains to all, and is handled by all, not in diffusion but

[f] Concil. Chalced., act. i. [ibid., col. 82 A et al.]
[g] Concil. Autisiodor., can. vii. [tom. iii. col. 444.]
[h] ['kalendis Novembris.']
[i] Socr. hist. eccl., lib. ii. [cap. 10.]
[j] Epist. iii. per Ruffinum. [concil. reg., tom. i. p. 113.]
[k] [ibid., p. 114.]
[l] [Mal. ii. 7.]
[m] [Heb. xiii. 7 and 17; 1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xx. 28.]

in representation; for *ecclesia est in episcopo et episcopus in ecclesia*, saith St. Cyprian[n], 'the church is in the bishop,' viz., by representment, 'and the bishop is in the church,' viz., as a pilot in a ship or a master in a family, or rather as a steward and guardian to rule in his master's absence. And for this reason the synod of the Nicene bishops is called in Eusebius[o] *conventus orbis terrarum*, and by St. Austin[p] *consensus totius ecclesiæ;* not that the whole church was there present in their several persons, but was there represented by the catholic bishops. And if this representment be not sufficient for obligation to all, I see no reason but the ladies too may vote in councils, for I doubt not but they have souls too.—But however, if this argument were concluding in itself, yet it loses its force in England, where the clergy are bound by laws of Parliament, and yet in the capacity of clergymen are allowed to choose neither procurators to represent us as clergy, nor knights of the shire to represent us as commons.

In conclusion of this I say to the presbyters, as St. Ambrose[q] said of the lay-judges whom the Arians would have brought to judge in council, (it was an old heretical trick,) *Veniant plane si qui sunt ad ecclesiam, audiant cum populo, non ut quisquam judex resideat, sed ut unusquisque de suo affectu habeat examen, eligat quem sequatur*, 'so may presbyters be present, so they may judge, not for others but for themselves.' And so may the people be present, and anciently were so; and therefore councils were always kept in open churches, *ubi populus judicat*, not for others but for themselves, not by external sentence but internal conviction; so St. Ambrose expounds himself in the forecited allegation.

There is no considerable objection against this discourse but that of the first council of Jerusalem, where the apostles and elders did meet together to determine of the question of circumcision; for although in the story of celebration of it we find no man giving sentence but Peter and James, yet in Acts xvi. they are called δόγματα κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, 'decrees judged by the apostles and elders.' But first, in this the difficulty is the less, because *presbyter* was a general word for all that were not of the number of the twelve, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors. And then secondly, it is none at all, because Paul and Barnabas are signally and by name reckoned as present in the synod, and one of them prolocutor, or else both: so that such presbyters may well define in such conventual assemblies. Thirdly, if there were any difficulty latent in the story, yet the catholic practice of God's church is certainly the best expositor of such places, where there either is

[n] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 168.]
[o] De vit. Constant., lib. iii. [cap. 6.—Σύνοδος οἰκουμενική.]
[p] De bapt. contr. Donat. [lib. i. cap. 18. tom. ix. col. 93 G.]
[q] Ep. xxxii. [Ben. xxi. § 6. tom. ii. col. 861 B.]

any difficulty, or where any is pretended; and of this I have already given account.

I remember also that this place is pretended for the people's power of voicing in councils. It is a pretty pageant, only that it is against the catholic practice of the church; against the exigence of scripture, which bids us require the law at the mouth of our spiritual rulers; against the gravity of such assemblies, for it would force them to be tumultuous, and at the best are the worst of sanctions, as being issues of popularity; and to sum up all, it is no way authorized by this first copy of christian councils. The pretence is in the synodal letter[r] written in the name of 'the apostles and elders and brethren,' that is, says Geta, the apostles and presbyters and people. But why not 'brethren,' that is, all the deacons, and evangelists, and helpers in government, and ministers of the churches? there is nothing either in words or circumstances to contradict this. If it be asked who then are meant by elders, if by 'brethren' St. Luke understands these church officers? I answer, that here is such variety, that although I am not certain which officers he precisely comprehends under the distinct titles of elders and brethren, yet here are enough to furnish both with variety, and yet neither to admit mere presbyters in the present acceptation of the word, nor yet the laity, to a decision of the question nor authorizing the decretal; for besides the twelve apostles, there were apostolical men which were presbyters and something more[s], as Paul, and Barnabas, and Silas; and evangelists, and pastors besides, which might furnish out the last appellative sufficiently. But however, without any further trouble it is evident that this word 'brethren' does not distinguish the laity from the clergy; "Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Judas and Silas, who were apostolical men, are called in scripture, "chief men among the brethren." But this is too known to need a contestation.

I only insert the saying of Basilius the emperor in the eighth synod[t], *De vobis autem laicis tam qui in dignitatibus quam qui absolute conversamini, quid amplius dicam non habeo quam quia nullo modo vobis licet de ecclesiasticis causis sermonem movere, neque penitus resistere integritati ecclesiæ et universali synodo adversari;* 'laymen,' says the emperor, 'must by no means meddle with causes ecclesiastical, nor oppose themselves to the catholic church, or councils œcumenical;' they must not meddle, for these things appertain to the cognizance of bishops and their decision. And now after all this, what authority is equal to this legislative of the bishops? μάλιστα δὲ, ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ἀρχὰς λεκτέον ταύτας, ὅσαις ἀποδίδοται βουλεύσασθαί τε περὶ τινῶν καὶ κρῖναι καὶ ἐπιτάξαι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦτο· τὸ

[r] [Acts xv. 25.] [s] [vid. p. 27 supra.]
[t] [tom. v. col. 920 E.]

γὰρ ἐπιτάττειν ἀρχικώτερον, saith Aristotle[u], 'they are all evidences of power and authority, to deliberate, to determine or judge, to make laws; but to make laws is the greatest power that is imaginable.' The first may belong fairly enough to presbyters, but I have proved the two latter to be appropriate to bishops.

§ 42. And the bishop had a propriety in the persons of his clerks.

Lastly, as if all the acts of jurisdiction and every imaginable part of power were in the bishop over the presbyters and subordinate clergy, the presbyters are said to be *episcoporum presbyteri*, the 'bishops' presbyters,' as having a propriety in them, and therefore a superiority over them; and as the bishop was a dispenser of those things which were *in bonis ecclesiæ*, so he was of the persons too a ruler in propriety. St. Hilary[v], in the book which himself delivered to Constantine[x], *Ecclesiæ adhuc*, saith he, *per presbyteros meos communionem distribuens*, 'I still give the holy communion to the faithful people by my presbyters.' And therefore in the third council of Carthage[y], a great deliberation was had about requiring a clerk of his bishop to be promoted in another church; *Denique qui unum habuerit, numquid debet illi ipse unus presbyter auferri?* saith Posthumianus, 'if the bishop have but one presbyter, must that one be taken from him?' *Id sequor*, saith Aurelius, *ut conveniam episcopum ejus, atque ei inculcem quod ejus clericus a qualibet ecclesia postuletur:* and it was resolved *ut clericum alienum nisi concedente ejus episcopo*, 'no man shall retain another bishop's clerk without the consent of the bishop whose clerk he is.'

When Athanasius[z] was abused by the calumny of the heretics his adversaries, and entered to purge himself, *Athanasius ingreditur cum Timotheo presbytero suo*, 'he comes in with Timothy his presbyter.' And Arsenius, *cujus brachium dicebatur excisum, lector aliquando fuerat Athanasii*, 'Arsenius was Athanasius his reader.' *Ubi autem ventum est ad rumores de poculo fracto a Macario presbytero Athanasii, &c.;* Macarius was another of Athanasius his priests, so Theodoret[a]. Peter and Irenæus were two more of his presbyters, as himself[b] witnesses. 'Paulinianus sometimes to visit us,' saith St. Hierome[c] to Pammachius, 'but not as your clerk,' *sed ejus a quo ordinatur*, 'his clerk who did ordain him.' But these things are too known to need multiplication of instances.

The sum is this: the question was whether or no, and how far, the bishops had superiority over presbyters in the primitive church?

[u] Polit., lib. iv. cap. 15. [tom. ii. p. 299.]
[v] [col. 1225 C.]
[x] [leg. 'Constantius.']
[y] Can. xlv. [et xxi. tom. i. coll. 967 et 963.]
[z] Eccles. hist. [scil. Ruffin.] lib. x. cap. 17. [p. 231 sq.]
[a] [lib. ii. cap. 8.]
[b] Athanas. epist. ad vitam solitar. agentes. [Ben. 'Hist. Arian. ad monachos,' § 26. tom. i. p. 359 D.]
[c] [Epist. xxxviii. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 332 fin.]

Their doctrine and practice have furnished us with these particulars: the power of church goods, and the sole dispensation of them, and a propriety of persons, was reserved to the bishop; for the clergy and church possessions were in his power, in his administration; the clergy might not travel without the bishop's leave, they might not be preferred in another diocese without license of their own bishop; in their own churches the bishop had sole power to prefer them, and they must undertake the burden of any promotion if he calls them to it; without him they might not baptize, not consecrate the eucharist, not communicate, not reconcile penitents, not preach; not only not without his ordination, but not without a special faculty besides the capacity of their order; the presbyters were bound to obey their bishops in their sanctions and canonical impositions, even by the decree of the apostles themselves, and the doctrine of Ignatius, and the constitution of St. Clement, of the fathers in the council of Arles, Ancyra, and Toledo, and many others; the bishops were declared to be judges in ordinary of the clergy and people of their diocese, by the concurrent suffrages of almost two thousand holy fathers, assembled in Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, in Carthage, Antioch, Sardis, Aquileia, Taurinum, Agatha, and by the emperor, and by the apostles: and all this attested by the constant practice of the bishops of the primitive church, inflicting censures upon delinquents and absolving them as they saw cause, and by the dogmatical resolution of the old catholics, declaring in their attributes and appellatives of the episcopal function that they have supreme and universal spiritual power (viz., in the sense above explicated) over all the clergy and laity of their diocese; as that 'they are higher than all power,' 'the image of God,' 'the figure of Christ,' 'Christ's vicar,' 'president of the church,' 'prince of priests,' 'of authority incomparable, unparalleled power,' and many more. If all this be witness enough of the superiority of episcopal jurisdiction, we have their depositions, we may proceed as we see cause for, and reduce our episcopacy to the primitive state, for that is truly a reformation, *Id dominicum quod primum, id hæreticum quod posterius*[d]; and then we shall be sure episcopacy will lose nothing by these unfortunate contestations.

§ 43. Their jurisdiction was over many congregations or parishes.

But against the cause it is objected *super totam materiam*, that bishops were not diocesan but parochial, and therefore of so confined a jurisdiction that perhaps our village or city priests shall advance their pulpit as high as the bishop's throne.

1. Well, put case they were not diocesan but parish bishops, what then? yet they were such bishops as had presbyters and deacons in subordination to them, in all the particular advantages of the former instances.

[d] [vid. Tertull. de Præscr. hær. cap. xxxi, et Adv. Prax. cap. ii. pp. 213, 501.]

2. If the bishops had the parishes, what cure had the priests? so that this will debase the priests as much as the bishops; and if it will confine a bishop to a parish, it will make that no presbyter can be so much as a parish priest. If it brings a bishop lower than a diocese, it will bring the priest lower than a parish. For set a bishop where you will, either in a diocese or a parish, a presbyter shall still keep the same duty and subordination, the same distance still. So that this objection, upon supposition of the former discourse, will no way mend the matter for any side, but make it far worse; it will not advance the presbytery, but it will depress the whole hierarchy, and all the orders of holy church.

But because this trifle is so much used amongst the enemies of episcopacy, I will consider it in little; and besides that it does no body any good advantage, I will represent it in its *fucus*, and shew the falsehood of it.

1. First then, it is evident that there were bishops before there were any distinct parishes; for the first division of parishes in the west was by Evaristus, who lived almost one hundred years after Christ, and divided Rome into seven parishes, assigning to every one a presbyter. So Damasus[e] reports of him in the pontifical book, *Hic titulos in urbe Roma divisit presbyteris, et septem diaconos ordinavit*[f] *qui custodirent episcopum prædicantem propter stylum veritatis*, 'he divided the parishes or titles in the city of Rome to presbyters.' The same also is by Damasus[e] reported of Dionysius in his life, *Hic presbyteris ecclesias divisit, et cœmeteria et parochias et diœceses constituit*[g]. Marcellus increased the number in the year 305; *hic fecit cœmeterium via Salaria, et viginti quinque titulos in urbe Roma constituit quasi diœceses propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis, et propter sepulturas martyrum*, 'he made a sepulture or cemetery for the burial of martyrs, and appointed twenty-five titles or parishes;' but he adds, *quasi diœceses*, 'as it had been dioceses,' that is, distinct and limited to presbyters as dioceses were to bishops; and the use of parishes which he subjoins, clears the business, for he appointed them only *propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum, et sepulturas*, 'for baptism, and penance, and burial;' for as yet there was no preaching in parishes, but in the mother church. Thus it was in the west.

But in Egypt we find parishes divided something sooner than the earliest of these; for Eusebius[h] reports out of Philo that the Christians in St. Mark's time had several churches in Alexandria: *etiam de ecclesiis quæ apud eos sunt ita dicit, Est autem in singulis locis consecrata orationi domus, &c.* But even before this there were bishops;

[e] [al. 'Anastasius in vitis pontificum,' (vid. p. 104. not. k, supra,) pp. 3, 12, 14.]

[f] ['constituit,' ed.]

[g] ['instituit,' ed.]

[h] Hist. eccles., lib. ii. cap. 17. [Ruffino interpr., p. 36.]

for in Rome there were four bishops before any division of parishes, though St. Peter be reckoned for none; and before parishes were divided in Alexandria, St. Mark himself, who did it, was the bishop; and before that time St. James was bishop of Jerusalem; and in divers other places where bishops were, there were no distinct parishes of a while after Evaristus's time, for when Dionysius[l] had assigned presbyters to several parishes, he writes of it to Severus bishop of Corduba, and desires him to do so too in his diocese, as appears in his epistle to him.

For indeed necessity required it, when the Christians multiplied and grew to be μέγιστος καὶ ἀναρίθμητος λαὸς, as Cornelius[k] called the Roman Christians, 'a great and innumerable people;' and did *implere omnia*, as Tertullian's[l] phrase is, filled all places; and public and great assemblies drew danger upon themselves, and increased jealousies in others, and their public offices could not be performed with so diffused and particular advantage, then they were forced to divide congregations, and assigned several presbyters to their cure in subordination to the bishop: and so we see, the elder christianity grew, the more parishes there were; at first in Rome there were none, Evaristus made seven, Dionysius made some more, and Marcellus added twenty-five, and in Optatus's[m] time there were forty.

Well then, the case is thus; parishes were not divided at first, therefore to be sure they were not of divine institution; therefore it is no divine institution that a presbyter should be fixed upon a parish; therefore also a parish is not by Christ's ordinance an independent body, for by Christ's ordinance there was no such thing at all, neither absolute nor in dependence neither; and then for the main issue, since bishops were before parishes, in the present sense, the bishops in that sense could not be parochial.

But which was first, a private congregation or a diocese? If a private congregation, then a bishop was at first fixed in a private congregation, and so was a parochial bishop; if a diocese was first, then the question will be, how a diocese could be without parishes, for what is a diocese but a jurisdiction over many parishes?

I answer, it is true that diocese and parish are words used now in contradistinction, and now a diocese is nothing but the multiplication of many parishes: *sed non fuit sic ab initio*, for at first a diocese was the city and the *regio suburbicaria*, 'the neighbouring towns,' in which there was no distinction of parishes; that which was a diocese in the secular sense, that is, a particular province or division of secular prefecture, that was the assignation of a bishop's charge. Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Laodicea, were κεφαλαὶ διοικήσεως, 'heads of the diocese,' saith Pliny[n], meaning in respect of secular

[l] Apud Binium, tom. i. Concil. [p. 159.]
[k] Euseb., lib. vi. [cap. 43.]
[l] Apol., cap. xxxvii. [p. 30 B.]
[m] Lib. ii. cont. Parmen. [cap. 4. p. 34.]
[n] Lib. v. c. 29 et 30. [tom. i. p. 274 sqq.]

jurisdiction; and so they were in ecclesiastical regiment. And it was so upon great reason, for when the regiment of the church was extended just so as the regiment of the commonwealth, it was of less suspicion to the secular power while the church regiment was just fixed together with the political[o], as if of purpose to shew their mutual consistence, and its own subordination. And besides this, there was in it a necessity, for the subjects of another province or diocese could not either safely or conveniently meet where the duty of the commonwealth did not engage them, but being all of one prefecture and diocese, the necessity of public meetings in order to the commonwealth would be fair opportunity for the advancement of their christendom. And this, which at first was a necessity in this case, grew to be a law in all, by the sanction of the council of Chalcedon[p], and of Constantinople *in Trullo*[q], τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων τάξις ἀκολουθείτω, 'let the order of the church follow the order and guise of the commonwealth,' viz., in her regiment and prefecture.—But in the modern sense of this division, a bishop's charge was neither a parish nor a diocese, as they are taken in relation; but a bishop had the supreme care of all the Christians which he by himself or his presbyters had converted, and he also had the charge of endeavouring the conversion of all the country. So that although he had not all the diocese actually in communion and subjection, yet his charge, his diocese, was so much: just as it was with the apostles, to whom Christ gave all the world for a diocese, yet at first they had but a small congregation that did actually obey them.

And now to the question, which was first, a particular congregation or a diocese, I answer, that a diocese was first; that is, the apostles had a charge before they had a congregation of converts; and St. Mark was sent bishop to Alexandria by St. Peter before any were converted: but ordinarily the apostles, when they had converted a city or nation, then fixed bishops upon their charge, and there indeed the particular congregation was before the bishop's taking of the diocese; but then this city or nation, although it was not the bishop's diocese before it was a particular congregation, yet it was part of the apostles' diocese, and this they concredited to the bishops respectively. St. Paul was ordained by the prophets at Antioch, apostle of the uncircumcision; all the gentiles was his diocese, and even of those places he then received power, which as yet he had not converted: so that absolutely, a diocese was before a particular congregation.—But if a diocese be taken collectively, as now it is, for a multitude of parishes united under one bishop, then one must needs be before twenty, and a particular congregation before a diocese; but then that particular congregation was not a parish in

[o] Vide Baron. A.D. 89. [n. 10.] et B. Rhenan. in Notit. provinc. imperial. in descript. Illyrici. [p. 209. 12mo. Par. 1602.]

[p] Can. xvii. [tom. ii. col. 607.]

[q] Can. xxxviii. [tom. iii. col. 1676.]

the present sense, for it was not a part of a diocese, taking a diocese for a collection of parishes; but that particular congregation was the first-fruits of his diocese, and like a grain of mustard seed, that in time might and did grow up to a considerable height, even to a necessity of distinguishing titles and parts of the diocese, assigning several parts to several priests.

2. We see that the primitive bishops before the division of parishes had the city and country, and after the division of parishes had them all under his jurisdiction, and ever even from the apostles' times had several provinces (some of them I mean) within their limits and charges. The thirty-fifth[r] canon of the apostles gives power to the bishop to dispose only of those things ὅσα τῇ αὐτοῦ παροικίᾳ ἐπιβάλλει καὶ ταῖς ὑπὸ αὐτὴν χώραις, 'which are under his diocese and the neighbour villages;' and the same thing is repeated in the ninth and tenth canons of the council of Antioch[s], calling it ἀρχαῖον τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, 'the ancient canon of our forefathers;' and yet itself is elder than three of the general councils; and if then it was an ancient canon of the fathers that the city and villages should be subject to the bishop, surely a primitive bishop was a diocesan.

But a little before this was the Nicene council[t], and there I am sure we have a bishop that is at least a diocesan: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, 'let the old customs be kept;' what are those? τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· 'let the bishop of Alexandria have power over all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis:' it was a good large parish; and yet this parish, if we have a mind to call it so, was κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔθος, 'according to the old custom of their forefathers,' and yet that was so early that St. Anthony was then alive, who was born in St. Irenæus's time, who was himself but second from the apostles.

It was also a good large parish that Ignatius was bishop of, even all Syria, Cœlesyria, Mesopotamia, and both the Ciliciæ; ἐπίσκοπος Συρίας, 'the bishop of Syria,' he calls himself in his epistle to the Romans[u]: and τῶν κατ' ἀνατολὴν ἐπισκόπων ἡγούμενος, so Theodoret[v]: and besides all these, his successors in the council of Chalcedon[x] had the two Phœniciæ and Arabia yielded to them by composition; these alone would have made two or three reasonably good parishes, and would have taken up time enough to perambulate, had that been then the guise of christendom.—But examples of this kind are infinite. Theodorus[y] bishop of Cyrus was pastor over eight hundred parishes; Athanasius was bishop of Alexandria, Egypt, Thebais, Mareotis, Libya, Ammoniaca, and Pentapolis, saith St. Epiphanius[z];

[r] [al. xxvii. p. 446.]
[s] [tom. i. col. 596 sq.]
[t] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 326.]
[u] [§ 2. p. 26.]
[v] Lib. v. [cap. 23.]
[x] Act. vii. [tom. ii. col. 492 E.]
[y] [leg. 'Theodoret.'] Epist. [cxiii.] ad Leon. i. episc. Rom. [Harduin. concil., tom. iv. p. 1190.]
[z] Hær. lxviii. [§ 1. p. 717.]

and his predecessor Julianus[a], successor of Agrippinus, was bishop τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐκκλησιῶν[b], 'of the churches about Alexandria;' either it was a diocese, or at least a plurality; St. Chrysostom[c] had Pontus, Asia, and all Thrace, in his parish, even as much as came to sixteen prefectures; a fair bounds surely. And so it was with all the bishops, a greater or a lesser diocese they had, but all were diocesan, for they had several parishes; *singuli ecclesiarum episcopi habent sub se ecclesias,* saith Epiphanius[d] in his epistle to John of Jerusalem; and in his book *Contra hæreses*[e], *Quotquot enim in Alexandria catholicæ ecclesiæ sunt, sub uno archiepiscopo sunt, privatimque ad has destinati sunt presbyteri propter ecclesiasticas necessitates, ita ut habitatores vicini sint uniuscujusque ecclesiæ.* All Italy was the parish of Liberius, saith Socrates[f]; Africa was St. Cyprian's parish, saith St. Gregory Nazianzen[g]; and St. Basil the great was parish priest to all Cappadocia[h]; but I rather believe if we examine their several stories they will rather prove metropolitans than mere parochians[i].

3. The ancient canons forbade a bishop to be ordained in a village, castle, or town. It was so decreed in the council of Laodicea[j], before the first Nicene, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους, 'in the villages or countries bishops must not be constituted.' And this was renewed in the council of Sardis[k], μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἁπλῶς καθιστᾷν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει ἤτινι καὶ εἷς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπάρκει, 'it is not lawful to ordain bishops in villages or little towns to which one presbyter is sufficient,' ἀλλ' ἐπίσκοποι ἐν ταύταις ταῖς πόλεσι καθιστᾷν ἐπισκόπους ὀφείλουσι ἔνθα καὶ πρότερον ἐτύγχανον γεγονότες ἐπίσκοποι, 'but bishops must ordain bishops in those cities where bishops formerly have been;' so that this canon does not make a new constitution, but perpetuates the old sanction; bishops *ab antiquo* were only ordained in great cities, and presbyters to[l] little villages: who then was the parish curate, the bishop or the priest? the case is too apparent.

Only here it is objected that some bishops were of small towns, and therefore these canons were not observed, and bishops might be and were parochial, as St. Gregory of Nazianzum, Zoticus of Comana, Maris in Dolicha; the one of these is called κώμη, by Eusebius[m]; and another πολίχνη, by Theodoret[n], 'a little town:' this is all is pretended for this great scarecrow of parochial bishops.

[a] ['Julinianus,' B, C.]
[b] Concil. Chalced., act. xvi. [?]
[c] Theodoret., lib. v. [cap. 28.]
[d] Apud S. Hieron. [epist. cx. al. lx. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 822.]
[e] [Hær. lxix. § 1. p. 727 C.]
[f] Lib. iv. [cap. 12.]
[g] Encom. Cypr. [scil. orat. xxiv. § 12. tom. i. p. 445 B.]
[h] Sozom., lib. v. [cap. 18.]
[i] Vide apud Euseb., lib. v. cap. 22. [p. 241.]
[j] Can. lvi. [al. lvii. tom. i. col. 791.]
[k] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 641.]
[l] ['in,' B, C.]
[m] Lib. v. cap. 16. [p. 231.]
[n] Lib. v. [cap. 4.]

But first, suppose these had been parishes, and these three parochial bishops, it follows not that all were; not those to be sure which I have proved to have been bishops of provinces and kingdoms. Secondly, it is a clear case that Nazianzum, though a small city, yet was the seat of a bishop's throne; so it is reckoned in the διατύπωσις made by Leo the emperor[o], where it is accounted *inter thronos ecclesiarum patriarchæ Constantinopolitano subjectarum*, and is in the same account with Cæsarea, with Ephesus, with Crete, with Philippi, and almost fourscore more.—As for Zoticus, he indeed came from Gomana a village town, for there he was born[p], but he was *episcopus Ostrenus*, 'bishop of Ostrea' in Armenia, saith Nicephorus[q].—And for Maris the bishop of Dolicha, it was indeed such a small city as Nazianzum was, but that proves not but his diocese and territory was large enough. Thus was Asclepius *vici non grandis*[r] but yet he was *Vagensis territorii*[s] *episcopus*. His seat might usually be in a little city, if it was one of those towns in which, according to the exigence of the canons, ἔνθα καὶ πρότερον ἐτύγχανον γεγονότες ἐπίσκοποι, 'in which bishops anciently were ordained,' and yet the appurtenances[t] of his diocese large, and extended, and too great for a hundred parish priests.

4. The institution of *chorepiscopi* proves most evidently that the primitive bishops were diocesan, not parochial. For they were instituted to assist the bishop in part of his country charge, and were περιόδευται, 'visiters,' as the council of Laodicea[u] calls them; but what need such suffragans, such coadjutors, to the managing of a parish? Indeed they might possibly have been needful for the managing of a city parish, especially if a whole city was a parish, as these objectors must pretend, or not say primitive bishops were parochial; but being these *chorepiscopi* were suffragans to the bishop, and did their offices in the country while the bishop was resident in the city, either the bishop's parish extended itself from city to country, and then it is all one with a diocese, or else we can find no employment for a *chorepiscopus* or visiter. The tenth canon of the council of Antioch[x] describes their use and power; *Qui in villis et vicis constituti sunt chorepiscopi, . . placuit sanctæ synodo ut modum proprium recognoscant, ut gubernent sibi subjectas ecclesias*, 'they were to govern the churches delegated to their charge.' It seems they had many churches under their provision, and yet they were but the bishop's vicars, for so it follows in the canon; 'he must not ordain any presbyters and deacons *absque urbis episcopo cui ipse subjicitur*

[o] Jus Græco-rom. p. 89. [num. lxxiii.]
[p] Vide Baron. An. Dom. 205. [n. 27.]
[q] Lib. iv. cap. 23. [tom. i. p. 320 D.]
[r] Gennad. apud Hieron. [fol. Par. 1602. tom. i. col. 399, in Asclepio.]
[s] Johan. de Trittenheim [al. Trithemius] de scriptt. eccles. [in Asclepio, p. 231.]
[t] [Had the writer lived in more recent times the colonial dioceses might have furnished him with an illustration. Dolicha was as large probably as Gibraltar.]
[u] [can. lvii. tom. i. col. 791.]
[x] [tom. i. col. 597.]

et regio, without leave of the bishop of the city, to whom both himself and all the country is subordinate.'

5. The bishop was one in a city wherein were many presbyters; ἓν θυσιαστήριον πάσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις, saith St. Ignatius[y], 'there is one altar in every church, and one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons.' Either then a whole city such as Rome or Jerusalem (which as Josephus reports had four hundred synagogues) must be but one parish, and then they as good call a bishop's charge a diocese as a parish in that latitude; or if there were many parishes in a city, and the bishop could have but one of them, why what hindered but that there might in a city be as many bishops as presbyters? for if a bishop can have but one parish, why may not every parish have a bishop? But by the ancient canons a city though never so great could have but one for itself and all the country; therefore every parish priest was not a bishop, nor the bishop a mere parish priest.

Ne in una civitate duo sint episcopi, was the constitution of the Nicene fathers, as saith Ruffinus[z]; and long before this it was so known a business that one city should have but one bishop, that Cornelius[a] exprobates to Novatus his ignorance, *Is ergo qui evangelium vendicabat nesciebat in ecclesia catholica unum episcopum esse debere, ubi videbat esse presbyteros quadraginta et sex,* 'Novatus' (the father of the old puritans) 'was a goodly gospeller, that did not know that in a catholic church there should be but one bishop, wherein there were forty-six presbyters;' intimating clearly that a church that had two bishops is not catholic, but schismatic at least, if both be pretended to be of a fixed residence; what then is he that would make as many bishops in a church as presbyters? he is θεόμαχος, he 'fights against God,' if St. Ambrose[b] say true, *Deus enim singulis ecclesiis singulos episcopos præesse decrevit,* 'God hath decreed that one bishop should rule in one church;' and of what extent his one church was may easily be guessed by himself, who was the ruler and bishop of the great city and province of Milan. And therefore when Valerius, as it was then sometimes used in several churches[c], had ordained St. Austin to be bishop of Hippo whereof Valerius was also bishop at the same time, St. Austin was troubled at it as an act most uncanonical, and yet he was not ordained to rule in common with Valerius, but to rule in succession and after the consummation of Valerius. It was the same case in Agelius[d] a Novatian bishop, ordaining Marcian to be his successor, and Sisinnius to succeed him; the acts were indeed irregular, but yet there was no harm in it to

[y] Epist. [interpol.] ad Philadelph. [§ 4. p. 77.]

[z] Hist. eccles., lib. x. [cap. 6. § 10. p. 222.]

[a] Apud Euseb., lib. vi. cap. 33. [p. 157.]

[b] In 1 Cor. xii. [ver. 28. tom. ii. append. col. 153 F.]

[c] Ὡς καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις. Epiphan. [hær. lxviii. § 6.]—Possidon. [sive Possidius] in vit. S. Aug. [cap. viii. col. 262.]

[d] Socr., lib. v. [cap. 21.]

this cause, they were ordained to succeed, not in conjunction. Διχονοίας σύμβολόν ἐστι, καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ θεσμοῦ ἀλλότριον, saith Sozomen[e], 'it is a note of schism, and against the rule of holy church, to have two bishops in one chair;' *Secundus episcopus nullus est*, saith St. Cyprian[f]; and as Cornelius[g] reports it in his epistle to St. Cyprian, it was the voice of the confessors that had been the instruments and occasions of the Novatian schism by erecting another bishop, *Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum esse, unum Christum esse Dominum quem confessi sumus, unum Spiritum sanctum, unum episcopum in catholica ecclesia esse debere.* And these very words the people also used in the contestation about Liberius and Felix; for when the emperor was willing that Liberius should return to his see on condition that Felix the Arian might be bishop there too, they derided the suggestion, crying out, "One God, one Christ, one bishop;" so Theodoret[h] reports. But who lists to see more of this may be satisfied, if plenty will do it, in St. Chrysostom[i], Theodoret[k], St. Hierome[l], Œcumenius[m], Optatus[n], St. Ambrose[o], and if he please he may read a whole book of it written by St. Cyprian[p], *De unitate ecclesiæ, sive de singularitate prælatorum.*

6. Suppose the ordinary dioceses had been parishes, yet what were the metropolitans and the primates? were they also parish-bishops? Surely if bishops were parochial, then these were at least diocesan by their own argument, for to be sure they had many bishops under them. But there were none such in the primitive church? Yes most certainly; the thirty-fifth[q] canon of the apostles tells us so most plainly, and at the worst they were a very primitive record; *Episcopos gentium singularum scire convenit quis inter eos primus habeatur, quem velut caput existiment, et nihil amplius præter ejus conscientiam gerant quam ea sola quæ parochiæ propriæ et villis quæ sub ea sunt competunt,* 'the bishops of every nation must know who is their primate, and esteem him as their head, and do nothing without his consent but those things that appertain to their own diocese.' And from hence the fathers of the council of Antioch[r] derived their sanction, *Per singulas regiones episcopos convenit nosse metropolitanum episcopum sollicitudinem totius provinciæ gerere, &c.* 'the bishops of every province must know that their metropolitan bishop does take cure of all the province.' For this was an apostolical constitution, saith St. Clement[s], that in the conversion of

[e] Lib. iv. [cap. 15 fin.]
[f] Lib. iv. ep. 2. [al. ep. lv. p. 104.]
[g] [In opp. S. Cypr. ep. xlix. p. 93.]
[h] [lib. ii. cap. 17.]
[i] [In Phil. i. 1. hom. i. tom. xi. p. 195 A.]
[k] [In eund. loc., tom. iii. p. 445.]
[l] [In eund. loc., tom. v. col. 1061.]
[m] [In eund. loc., p. 655.]
[n] Contr. Parmen., lib. ii. [cap. 2, 3 et passim.]
[o] In 1 Tim. iii. [ver. 12, 3.] et Phil. i. [ver. 1. tom. ii. append. coll. 295 E, 251 C.]
[p] [p. 104 sqq.]
[q] [al. xxvii.]
[r] Concil. Antioch., can. ix. [tom. i. col. 595.]
[s] Epist. i. ad Jacobum fratrem Domini. [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 94.]

gentile cities, in place of the archflamines, archbishops, primates, or patriarchs, should be placed, *qui reliquorum episcoporum judicia et majora (quoties necesse foret) negotia in fide agitarent, et secundum Dei voluntatem, sicut constituerunt sancti apostoli, . . definirent.* Alexandria was a metropolitical see long before the Nicene council, as appears in the sixth canon before cited[t]; nay, Dioscorus[u] the bishop of that church was required to bring ten of the metropolitans that he had under him to the council of Ephesus, by Theodosius and Valentinian emperors; so that it was a patriarchate.

These are enough to shew that in the primitive church there were metropolitan bishops. Now then either bishops were parochial, or no: if no, then they were diocesan; if yea, then at least many of them were diocesan; for they had according to this rate many parochial bishops under them.—But I have stood too long upon this impertinent trifle; but as now-a-days it is made, the consideration of it is material to the main question. Only this I add, that if any man should trouble the world with any other fancy of his own, and say that our bishops are nothing like the primitive because all the bishops of the primitive church had only two towns in their charge and no more, and each of these towns had in them a hundred and seventy families, and were bound to have no more, how should this man be confuted? It was just such a device as this in them that first meant to disturb this question by pretending that the bishops were only parochial, not diocesan, and that there was no other bishop but the parish priest: most certainly themselves could not believe the allegation, only they knew it would raise a dust; but by God's providence there is water enough in the primitive fountains to allay it.

§ 44. And was aided by presbyters, but not impaired.

Another consideration must here be interposed concerning the intervening of presbyters in the regiment of the several churches. For though I have twice already shewn that they could not challenge it of right, either by divine institution or apostolical ordinance; yet here also it must be considered how it was in the practice of the primitive church; for those men that call the bishop a pope are themselves desirous to make a conclave of cardinals too, and to make every diocese a Roman consistory.

1. First then, the first thing we hear of presbyters, (after scripture, I mean, for of it I have already given account,) is from the testimony of St. Hierome[x], *Antequam . . studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, &c. . . communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur,* 'before factions arose in the church, the church was governed by the common counsel of presbyters.' Here St. Hierome either means it of the time before bishops were consti-

[t] [vid. p. 180. not. t, supra.]

[u] Vide Concil. Chalced., act. 1, in epist. Theod. et Valentin. Imp. [tom. ii. col. 71.]

[x] In epist. ad Titum, c. 1. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 413.]

tuted in particular churches, or after bishops were appointed. If before bishops were appointed, no hurt done, the presbyters might well rule in common before themselves had a ruler appointed to govern both them and all the diocese beside. For so St. Ignatius[y], writing to the church of Antioch, exhorts the presbyters to feed the flock until God should declare *τὸν μέλλοντα ἄρχειν ὑμῶν*, 'whom He would make their ruler.' And St. Cyprian[z], speaking of Etecusa and some other women that had made defailance in time of persecution, and so were put to penance, *præceperunt eas præpositi tantisper sic esse, donec episcopus constituatur;* 'the presbyters,' whom *sede vacante* he *præter morem suum* calls *præpositos*, they 'gave order that they should so remain till the consecration of a bishop.'—But if St. Hierome means this saying of his, after bishops were fixed, then his expression answers the allegation, for it was but *communi consilio presbyterorum*, the *judicium* might be solely in the bishop; he was the judge, though the presbyters were the counsellors. For so himself adds, that 'upon occasion of those first schisms in Corinth, it was decreed in all the world *ut omnis ecclesiæ cura ad unum pertineret*, all the care of the diocese was in the bishop,' and therefore all the power; for it was unimaginable that the burden should be laid on the bishop, and the strength put into the hands of the presbyters. And so St. Ignatius styles them *σύμβουλοι καὶ συνέδρεναὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*, 'assessors and counsellors to the bishop.' But yet if we take our estimate from Ignatius, the bishop is 'the ruler,' without him, though all concurred, yet nothing could be done, nothing attempted; the bishop was 'superior in all power and authority;' he was 'to be obeyed in all things and contradicted in nothing;' the bishop's 'judgment was to sway,' and 'nothing must seem pleasing to the presbyters that was cross to the bishop's sentence:' this and a great deal more which I have formerly made use of is in Ignatius[a], and now let their assistance and counsel extend as far as it will, the bishop's authority is invulnerable. But I have already enough discussed this instance of St. Hierome's, § 21; thither I refer the reader.

2. But St. Cyprian must do this business for us, if any man, for of all the bishops he did acts of the greatest condescension and seeming declination of episcopal authority. But let us see the worst[b]. *Ad id vero quod scripserunt mihi compresbyteri nostri, . . solus rescribere nihil potui, quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis mea privatim sententia gerere;* and again[c], *Quamvis mihi videantur debere pacem accipere, tamen ad consultum vestrum eos dimisi, ne videar aliquid temere præsumere;* and a third time[d], *Quæ res cum omnium nostrum consilium*

[y] Epist. [suppos.] ad Antioch. [§ 8. p. 106.]
[z] [ep. xxi. p. 46.]
[a] Ad Trallian. [interpol. § 7.] Ad Magnes. [§ 3, 7. pp. 63, 54, 5.]
[b] Epist. vi. [al. xiv. p. 33.]
[c] Epist. xix. [al. xxiv. p. 50.]
[d] Epist. xviii. [al. xxvi. p. 51.]

et sententiam spectet[e], *præjudicare ego et soli mihi rem communem vendicare non audeo.* These are the greatest steps of episcopal humility that I find *in materia juridica;* the sum whereof is this, that St. Cyprian did consult his presbyters and clergy in matters of consequence, and resolved to do nothing without their advice. But then consider also, 1) It was *statui apud me,* 'I have resolved with myself' to do nothing without your counsel; it was no necessity *ab extra,* no duty, no sanction of holy church, that bound him to such a modesty; it was his own voluntary act. 2) It was as well *diaconorum* as *presbyterorum consilium* that he would have in conjunction, as appears by the titles of the sixth and eighteenth[f] epistles, *Cyprianus presbyteris et diaconis fratribus salutem,* so that here the presbyters can no more challenge a power of regiment in common, than the deacons, by any divine law or catholic practice. 3) St. Cyprian also would actually have the consent of the people too; and that will as well disturb the *jus divinum* of an independent presbytery as of an independent episcopacy.

But indeed neither of them both need to be much troubled, for all this was voluntary in St. Cyprian, like Moses, *qui cum in potestate sua habuit ut solus possit præesse populo, seniores elegit,* to use St. Hierome's expression[g], 'who, when it was in his power alone to rule the people, yet chose seventy elders for assistants:' for as for St. Cyprian, this very epistle[h] clears it that no part of his episcopal authority was impaired; for he shews what himself alone could do: *Fretus ergo et dilectione et religione vestra, quam satis novi, his literis et hortor et mando, &c.;* 'I entreat and command you,' *vice mea fungamini circa gerenda ea quæ administratio religiosa deposcit,* 'be my substitutes in the administration of church affairs.' He entreats them *pro dilectione,* 'because they loved him;' he commands them *pro religione,* 'by their religion;' for it was a piece of their religion to obey him, and in him was the government of his church; else how could he have put the presbyters and deacons in substitution?

Add to this, it was the custom of the church that although the bishop did only impose hands in the ordination of clerks, yet the clergy did approve and examine the persons to be ordained, and it being a thing of public interest, it was then not thought fit to be a personal action both in preparation and ministration too; (and for this St. Chrysostom was accused *in concilio nefario,* as the title[i] of the edition of it expresses it, that he made ordinations ἄνευ συνεδρίου καὶ παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ κλήρου) yet when St. Cyprian saw occasion for it, he did ordain without the consent of the clergy of his church; for so he ordained Celerinus[k]; so he ordained Optatus and Saturus[l],

[e] [al. 'expectet.']
[f] [al. xiv. et xxvi. pp. 31, 51. 'Diaconibus,' xxvi.]
[g] [vid.] In 1. ad Titum. [tom. iv. part. i. col. 414.]
[h] [ep. xiv. p. 31.]
[i] Jus Græco-rom. [p. 554.—παράνομος σύνοδος.]
[k] [ep. xxxix. p. 76.]
[l] [ep. xxix. p. 55.]

when himself was from his church, and in great want of clergymen to assist in the ministration of the daily offices. He did as much in jurisdiction too and censures; for himself did excommunicate Felicissimus and Augendus, and Repostus, and Irene, and Paula, as appears in his thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth epistles[m], and tells Rogatianus[n] that he might have done as much to the petulant deacon that abused him, by virtue of his episcopal authority; and the same power singly and solely he exercised in his acts of favour and absolution; *unus atque alius, obnitente plebe et contradicente, mea tamen facilitate suscepti sunt*[o]. Indeed here is no contradiction of the clergy expressed, but yet the absolution said to be his own act, against the people and without the clergy, for he alone was the judge; insomuch that he declared that it was the cause of schism and heresy, that the bishop was not obeyed, *nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur*[p], 'and that one high-priest in a church, and judge, instead of Christ, is not admitted.' So that the bishop must be one, and that one must be judge, and to acknowledge more in St. Cyprian's *Lexicon* is called schism and heresy. Further yet, this judicatory of the bishop is independent, and responsive to none but Christ[q]; *Actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus;* and again[r], *Habet in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus,* 'the bishop is lord of his own actions, and may do what seems good in his own eyes, and for his actions he is to account to Christ.'

This general account is sufficient to satisfy the allegations out of the sixth and eighteenth epistles[s], and indeed, the whole question. But for the eighteenth epistle there is something of peculiar answer; for first, it was a case of public concernment, and therefore he would so comply with the public interest as to do it by public counsel. Secondly, it was 'a necessity of times' that made this case peculiar, *necessitas temporum facit ut non temere pacem demus,* (they are the first words of the next epistle[t], which is of the same matter,) for if the *lapsi* had been easily and without a public and solemn trial reconciled, it would have made gentile sacrifices frequent, and martyrdom but seldom. Thirdly, the common counsel which St. Cyprian here said he would expect was the counsel of the confessors, to whom for a peculiar honour it was indulged, that they should be interested in the public assoiling of such penitents who were overcome with those fears which the confessors had overcome: so that this is evidently an act of positive and temporary discipline; and as it is no disadvantage to the power of the bishop, so to be sure no advantage to the presbyter.—But the clause of objection from the nineteenth epistle is

[m] [al. xli. sq. p. 79 sqq.]
[n] Ep. lxv. [al. iii. p. 5.]
[o] Ep. lv. [al. lix. p. 137.]
[p] Ibid. [p. 129.]
[q] Ep. lii. [al. lv. p. 110.]
[r] Ep. lxxii. [fin. p. 198.]
[s] [al. xiv. et. xxvi.]
[t] [xix. al. xxiv.]

yet unanswered, and that runs something higher, *tamen ad consultum vestrum eos dimisi, ne videar aliquid temere præsumere;* it is called 'presumption' to reconcile the penitents without the advice of those to whom he writ. But from this we are fairly delivered by the title, *Cypriano et compresbyteris Carthagini consistentibus, Caldonius salutem.* It was not the epistle of Cyprian to his presbyters, but of Caldonius one of the suffragan bishops of Numidia to his metropolitan; and now what wonder if he call it presumption to do an act of so public consequence without the advice of his metropolitan? He was bound to consult him by the canons apostolical and so he did, and no harm done to the present question, of the bishop's sole and independent power, and unmixed with the conjunct interest of the presbytery, who had nothing to do beyond ministry, counsel, and assistance.

3. In all churches where a bishop's seat was there were not always a college of presbyters, but only in the greatest churches. For some times in the lesser cities there were but two; *Esse oportet et aliquantos presbyteros, ut bini sint per ecclesias, et unus in civitate episcopus,* so St. Ambrose[u]. Sometimes there was but one in a church; Posthumianus in the third council of Carthage[x] put the case, *Deinde qui unum presbyterum habuerit, nnmquid debet illi ipse unus presbyter auferri?* The church of Hippo had but one; Valerius was the bishop and Austin was the priest, and after him Austin was the bishop and Eradius[y] the priest. Sometimes not one, as in the case Aurelius put in the same council now cited, of a church that had never a presbyter to be consecrated bishop in the place of him that died; and once at Hippo they had none, even then when the people snatched St. Austin and carried him to Valerius to be ordained. In these cases I hope it will not be denied but the bishop was judge alone; I am sure he had but little company, sometimes none at all.

4. But suppose it had been always done that presbyters were consulted in matters of great difficulty and possibility of scandal, for so St. Ambrose[z] intimates, *Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in ecclesia* (understand in these churches where presbyters were fixed), yet this might be necessary, and was so indeed in some degree, at first, which in succession as it proved troublesome to the presbyters, so unnecessary and impertinent to the bishops. At first I say it might be necessary, for, 1) They were times of persecutions and temptation; and if both the clergy and people too were not complied withal in such exigence of time and agonies of spirit, it was the way to make them relapse to gentilism; for a discontented spirit will hide itself and take sanctuary in the reeds and mud of Nilus, rather than not take complacence in an imaginary security and

[u] In 1 Tim. iii. [ver. 12, 3. tom. ii. append. col. 295 E.]

[x] [can. xlv. tom. i. col. 967.]

[y] [al. 'Eraclius.']

[z] [In 1 Tim. v. 2. tom. ii. append. col. 298 E.]

revenge. 2) As yet there had been scarce any synods to determine cases of public difficulty, and what they could not receive from public decision it was fitting they should supply by the maturity of a consiliary assistance and deliberation; for although by the canons of the apostles[a] bishops were bound twice a year to celebrate synods, yet persecution intervening, they were rather twice a year a διασπορὰ than συνοδὸς, a 'dispersion' than a 'synod.' 3) Although synods had been as frequently convened as was intended by the apostles, yet it must be length of time and a successive experience that must give opportunity and ability to give general rules for the emergency of all particulars; and therefore till the church grew of some considerable age a fixed standing college of presbyters was more requisite than since it hath been, when the frequency of general councils and provincial synods, and the peace of the church, and the innumerable volumes of the fathers, and decretals of bishops, and a digest of ecclesiastical constitutions, hath made the personal assistance of presbyters unnecessary. 4) When necessity required not their presence and counsel, their own necessity required that they should attend their several cures. For let it be considered, they that would now have a college of presbyters assist the bishop, whether they think of what follows; for either they must have presbyters ordained without a title, which I am sure they have complained of these threescore years, or else they must be forced to non-residence; for how else can they assist the bishop in the ordinary and daily occurrences of the church, unless either they have no cure of their own, or else neglect it? and as for the extraordinary, either the bishop is to consult his metropolitan, or he may be assisted by a synod, if the canons already constitute[b] do not aid him; but in all these cases the presbytery is impertinent.

5. As this assistance of presbyters was at first for necessity, and after by custom it grew a law; so now *retro*, first the necessity failed, and then the desuetude abrogated the law which before custom had established: *quod qua negligentia obsoleverit nescio*, saith St. Ambrose[c], 'he knew not how it came to be obsolete,' but so it was, it had expired before his time. Not but that presbyters were still in mother churches, I mean in great ones; *in ecclesia enim habemus senatum nostrum, actum*[d] *presbyterorum*, 'we have still,' said St. Hierome[e], 'in the church our senate, a college or chapter of presbyters,' (he was then at Rome or Jerusalem,) but they were not consulted in church affairs and matter of jurisdiction; that was it that St. Ambrose wondered how it came to pass. And thus it is to this day. In our mother churches we have a chapter too, but the bishop consults them not in matters of ordinary jurisdiction; just so it was in St. Ambrose his time, and therefore our bishops have altered no custom in this parti-

[a] [can. xxx. al. xxxviii.]
[b] ['constituted,' B, C.]
[c] [vid. not. a, supra.]
[d] [leg. 'cœtum.']
[e] In Isai. iii. [tom. iii. col. 34.]

cular; the alteration was pregnant even before the end of the four general councils, and therefore is no violation of a divine right, for then most certainly a contrary provision would have been made in those conventions, wherein so much sanctity, and authority, and catholicism, and severe discipline, were conjunct. And then besides, it is no innovation in practice which pretends so fair antiquity; but however, it was never otherwise than voluntary in the bishops, and positive discipline in the church, and conveniency in the thing for that present, and counsel in the presbyters, and a trouble to the presbyters' persons and a disturbance of their duties when they came to be fixed upon a particular charge.

One thing more before I leave. I find a canon of the council of Hispalis[f] objected, *Episcopus presbyteris solus honorem dare potest, solus autem auferre non potest,* 'a bishop may alone ordain a priest, a bishop may not alone depose a priest;' therefore, in censures there was in the primitive church a necessity of conjunction of presbyters with the bishop in imposition of censures.—To this I answer,

First, it is evident that he that can give an honour can also take it away, if any body can; for there is in the nature of the thing no greater difficulty in pulling down than in raising up: it was wont always to be accounted easier; therefore this canon, requiring a conjunct power in deposing presbyters, is a positive constitution of the church, founded indeed upon good institution, but built upon no deeper foundation, neither of nature or higher institution, than its own present authority.

But that's enough, for we are not now in question of divine right, but of catholic and primitive practice. To it therefore I answer,

Secondly, that the conjunct hand required to pull down a presbyter was not the chapter or college of presbyters, but a company of bishops, a synodal sentence and determination; for so the canon runs, *qui profecto nec ab uno damnari nec uno judicante poterunt honoris sui privilegiis exui, sed præsentati synodali judicio, quod canon de illis præceperit definiri.* And the same thing was determined in the Greeks' council of Carthage[g], 'If a presbyter or a deacon be accused, their own bishop shall judge them, not alone, but with the assistance of six bishops more in the case of a presbyter, three of a deacon, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν κληρικῶν τὰς αἰτίας καὶ μόνος ὁ ἐντόπιος ἐπίσκοπος διαγνῷ καὶ περατώσῃ, but the causes of the other clergy, the bishop of the place must alone hear and determine them.' So that by this canon, in some things the bishop might not be alone, but then his assistants were bishops, not presbyters: in other things he alone was judge, without either; and yet his sentences must not be clancular, but in open court, in the full chapter, for his presbyters must be present; and so it is determined for Africa, in the fourth

[f] Can. vi. [leg. 'sacerdotibus ac ministris.'—Tom. iii. col. 559.]
[g] Can. xx. [tom. i. col. 875.]

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

council of Carthage[h], *Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum, alioquin irrita erit sententia episcopi nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur.* Here is indeed a necessity of the presence of the clergy of his church where his consistory was kept, lest the sentence should be clandestine, and so illegal, but it is nothing but *præsentia clericorum*, for it is *sententia episcopi;* 'the bishop's sentence,' and 'the clerks' presence' only; for μόνος ὁ ἐντόπιος ἐπίσκοπος, 'the bishop alone' might give sentence in the causes of the inferior clergy, even by this canon itself, which is used for objection against the bishop's sole jurisdiction.

I know nothing now to hinder our process; for the bishop's jurisdiction is clearly left in his own hand, and the presbyters had no share in it but by delegation and voluntary assumption. Now I proceed in the main question.

§ 45. So that the government of the church by bishops was believed necessary.

We have seen what episcopacy is in itself, now from the same principles let us see what it is to us.

And first, antiquity taught us it was simply necessary, even to the being and constitution of a church: that runs high, but we must follow our leaders. St. Ignatius[i] is express in this question: *Qui intra altare est, mundus est, quare et obtemperat episcopo et sacerdotibus; qui vero foris est, hic is est qui sine episcopo, sacerdote, et diacono, quicquam agit, et ejusmodi inquinatam habet conscientiam, et infideli deterior est;* 'he that is within the altar,' that is, within the communion of the church, 'he is pure, for he obeys the bishop and the priests; but he that is without, that is, does any thing without his bishop and the clergy, he hath a filthy conscience, and is worse than an infidel;' *necesse itaque est quicquid facitis ut sine episcopo nihil faciatis,* 'it is necessary that whatever ye do ye be sure to do nothing without the bishop;' *quid enim aliud est episcopus, &c.,* 'for what else is a bishop but he that is greater than all power?' So that the obeying the bishop is the necessary condition of a christian and catholic communion, he that does not is worse than an infidel. The same also he affirms again[k], *Quotquot enim Christi, sunt partium episcopi; qui vero ab illo declinant, et cum maledictis communionem amplectuntur, hi cum illis excidentur;* 'all them that are on Christ's side are on the bishop's side, but they that communicate with accursed schismatics shall be cut off with them.' If then we will be Christ's servants, we must be obedient and subordinate to the bishop: it is the condition of christianity; we are not Christians else: so is the intimation of St. Ignatius.

As full and pertinent is the peremptory resolution of St. Cyprian

[h] Can. xxiii. [tom. i. col. 980.] [k] Epist. [interpol.] ad Philadelph. [i] Epist. [interpol.] ad Trall. [§ 7. (§ 3. p. 75.) p. 63.]

in that admirable epistle of his *ad Lapsos*[l], where after he had spoken how Christ instituted the honour of episcopacy in concrediting the keys to St. Peter and the other apostles, *Inde*, saith he, *per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur*, 'hence is it that by several successions of bishops the church is continued, so that the church hath its being or constitution by bishops, and every act of ecclesiastical regiment is to be disposed by them.' *Cum hoc itaque divina lege fundatum sit, miror, &c.*, 'since therefore this is so established by the law of God, I wonder any man should question it,' &c., and therefore as in all buildings the foundation being gone the fabric falls, so 'if ye take away bishops, the church must ask a writing of divorce from God, for it can no longer be called a church.' This account we have from St. Cyprian, and he reinforces again upon the same charge in his epistle *ad Florentium Pupianum*[m], where he makes a bishop to be ingredient into the definition of a church, *Ecclesia est plebs sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo grex adhærens*, 'the church is a flock adhering to its pastor, and a people united to their bishop;' for that so he means by *sacerdos* appears in the words subjoined, *Unde et scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo, et si qui cum episcopo non sit, in ecclesia non esse, et frustra sibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt, et latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt, &c.*, 'as a bishop is in the church, so the church is in the bishop, and he that does not communicate with the bishop is not in the church; and therefore they vainly flatter themselves that think their case fair and good if they communicate in conventicles and forsake their bishop.'

And for this cause the holy primitives were so confident and zealous for a bishop that they would rather expose themselves and all their tribes to a persecution than to the greater misery, the want of bishops. Fulgentius[n] tells an excellent story to this purpose. When Trasamund king of Byzac in Africa had made an edict that no more bishops should be consecrate, to this purpose that the catholic faith might expire (so he was sure it would if this device were perfected) *ut arescentibus truncis absque palmitibus omnes ecclesiæ desolarentur*, the good bishops of the province met together in a council, and having considered of the command of the tyrant, *Sacra turba pontificum qui remanserant communicato inter se consilio definierunt adversus præceptum regis in omnibus locis celebrare ordinationes pontificum, cogitantes aut regis iracundiam si qua forsan existeret mitigandam, quo facilius ordinati in suis plebibus viverent, aut si perse-*

[l] Epist. xxvii. [al. xxxiii. p. 66,] et alibi.
[m] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 168.]
[n] Vide Concil. Byzacenum, An. Dom. 504. [apud Baron. ubi infra,] et Surium, die 1 Januar. [tom. i. p. 32,] et Baron. in A.D. 504. [tom. vi. p. 562.—The narration is not by Fulgentius, but by the writer of his life in Surius, and was read by Taylor in Baronius.]

cutionis violentia nasceretur, coronandos etiam fidei confessione quos dignos inveniebant promotione: it was full of bravery and christian sprite; 'the bishops resolved, for all the edict against new ordination of bishops, to obey God rather than man, and to consecrate bishops in all places, hoping the king would be appeased; or if not, yet those whom they thought worthy of a mitre were in a fair disposition to receive a crown of martyrdom.' They did so; *fit repente communis assumptio,* and they all strived who should be first, and thought a blessing would outstrip the hindmost: they were sure they might go to heaven, though persecuted, under the conduct of a bishop; they knew without him the ordinary passage was obstructed.

Pius the first[o], bishop of Rome and martyr, speaking of them that calumniate and disgrace their bishops, endeavouring to make them infamous, 'they add,' saith he, 'evil to evil and grow worse,' *non intelligentes quod ecclesia Dei in sacerdotibus consistit, et crescit in templum Dei,* 'not considering that the church of God doth consist' or is established 'in bishops, and grows up to a holy temple.'

To him I am most willing to add St. Hierome[p], because he is often obtruded in defiance of the cause, *Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet,* 'the safety of the church depends upon the bishop's dignity.'

§ 46. For they are schismatics that separate from their bishop.

The reason which St. Hierome gives presses this business to a further particular; 'for if an eminent dignity and an unmatchable power be not given to him,' *tot efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes:* so that he makes bishops therefore necessary, because without them the unity of a church cannot be preserved; and we know that unity, and being, are of equal extent; and if the unity of the church depends upon the bishop, then where there is no bishop, no pretence to a church; and therefore to separate from the bishop makes a man at least a schismatic.

For unity, which the fathers press so often, they make to be dependent on the bishop. *Nihil sit in vobis quod possit vos dirimere, sed unimini episcopo, subjecti Deo per ipsum in Christo,* saith St. Ignatius[q], 'let nothing divide you, but be united to your bishop, being subject to God in Christ through your bishop.' And it is his *congé* to the people of Smyrna, to whom he writ in his epistle to Polycarpus[r], *Opto vos semper valere in Deo nostro Jesu Christo, in quo manete per unitatem Dei et episcopi*[s], 'farewell in Christ Jesus, in whom remain by the unity of God and of the bishop.' *Quanto vos beatiores judico, qui dependetis ab illo (episcopo), sic ut ecclesia a*

[o] Epist. ii. [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 228.]

[p] Advers. Lucifer., cap. 4. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 295.]

[q] Epist. [interpol.] ad Magnes. [§ 6. p. 55.]

[r] [§ 8. p. 42.]

[s] [ἐν ἑνότητι θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπῆ.—Coteler.]

Domino Jesu et Dominus a . . Patre suo, ut omnia per unitatem consentiant[t], 'blessed people are ye that depend upon your bishop, as the church on Christ, and Christ on God, that all things may consent in unity.'

Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt aut nata sunt schismata quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur[u], 'hence come schisms, hence spring heresies, that the bishop is not obeyed, and admitted alone to be the high priest, alone to be the judge.' The same St. Cyprian repeats again[x], and by it we may see his meaning clearer, *Qui audit vos, me audit, &c., inde enim hæreses et schismata oborta sunt et oriuntur, dum episcopus, qui unus est et ecclesiæ præest, superba quorundam præsumptione contemnitur, et homo dignatione Dei honoratus indignus ab hominibus judicatur,* 'the pride and peevish haughtiness of some factious people that contemn their bishops, is the cause of all heresy and schism.' And therefore it was so strictly forbidden by the ancient canons that any man should have any meetings or erect an altar out of the communion of his bishop, that if any man proved delinquent in this particular he was punished with the highest censures, as appears in the thirty-second canon of the apostles[y], in the sixth canon of the council of Gangra[z], the fifth canon of the council of Antioch[a], and the great council of Chalcedon[b], all which I have before cited.

The sum is this, the bishop is the band and ligature of the church's unity, and separation from the bishop is διχονοίας σύμβολον, as Theodoret's[c] expression is, 'a symbol of faction,' and he that separates is a schismatic.

But how if the bishop himself be a heretic or schismatic; may we not then separate? Yes, if he be judged so by a synod of bishops, but then he is sure to be deposed too, and then in these cases no separation from a bishop: for till he be declared so, his communion is not to be forsaken by the subjects of his diocese, lest they by so doing become their judge's judge; and when he is declared so, no need of withdrawing from obedience to the bishop, for the heretic or schismatic must be no longer bishop. But let the case be what it will be, no separation from a bishop, *ut sic*, can be lawful; and yet if there were a thousand cases in which it were lawful to separate from a bishop, yet in no case is it lawful to separate from episcopacy; that is the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow to christianity, and a confronting of a divine institution.

[t] Ad Ephes. [§ 5. p. 45.]
[u] St. Cyprian, ep. lv. [al. lix. p. 129.]
[x] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 167.]
[y] [al. xxiv. p. 446.]
[z] [tom. i. col. 535.]
[a] [tom. i. col. 595.]
[b] Act. iv. [tom. ii. col. 433.]
[c] [Qu. Sozomen's? see p. 184. note e, above.]

§ 47. And heretics. But is it not also heresy? Aërius was condemned for heresy by the catholic church. The heresy from whence the Aërians were denominated was *sermo furiosus magis quam humanæ conditionis, et dicebat, Quid est episcopus ad presbyterum? nihil differt hic ab illo,* 'a mad and an unmanly heresy, to say that a bishop and a priest are all one,' so Epiphanius[d]: *assumpsit autem ecclesia, et in toto mundo assensus factus est, antequam esset Aërius, et qui ab ipso appellantur Aëriani:* and the good catholic father is so angry at the heretic Aërius that he thinks his name was given him by Providence, and he is called Aërius *ab aëriis spiritibus pravitatis,* for he was possessed with an unclean spirit; he could never else have been the inventor of such heretical pravity. St. Austin[e] also reckons him in the accursed roll of heretics, and adds at the conclusion of his catalogue, 'that he is no catholic Christian that assents to any of the foregoing doctrines;' amongst which this is one of the principal. Philastrius[f] does as much for him.

But against this it will be objected,

1) That heresies in the primitive catalogues are of a large extent, and every dissent from a public opinion was esteemed heresy;

2) Aërius was called heretic for denying prayer for the dead, and why may he not be as blameless in equalling a bishop and a presbyter, as in that other, for which he also is condemned by Epiphanius and St. Austin;

3) He was never condemned by any council; and how then can he be called heretic?—I answer,

1) That dissent from a public or a received opinion was never called heresy unless the contrary truth was indeed a part of catholic doctrine. For the fathers many of them did so, as St. Austin from the millenary opinion; yet none ever reckoned them in the catalogues of heretics, but such things only set them down there which were either directly opposite to catholic belief, though *in minoribus articulis,* or to a holy life.

2) It is true that Epiphanius and St. Austin reckon his denying prayer for the dead to be one of his own opinions, and heretical. But I cannot help it, if they did; let him and them agree it; they are able to answer for themselves. But yet they accused him also of Arianism; and shall we therefore say that Arianism was no heresy, because the fathers called him heretic in one particular upon a wrong principal[g]? We may as well say this as deny the other.

3) He was not condemned by any council. No, for his heresy was ridiculous, and a scorn to all wise men, as Epiphanius observes; and it made no long continuance, neither had it any considerable party. But yet this is certain, that Epiphanius, and Philastrius, and

[d] Hær. lxxv. [§§ 3, 6. pp. 906 D, 910 D.]
[e] [De hær. liii. tom. viii. col. 18 E.]
[f] [cap. 72. p. 140. 8vo Hamb. 1721.]
[g] [sic edd.]

St. Austin, called this opinion of Aërius a heresy, and against the catholic belief. And themselves affirm that the church did so; and then it would be considered, that it is but a sad employment to revive old heresies, and make them a piece of the new religion.

And yet after all this, if I mistake not, although Aërius himself was so inconsiderable as not to be worthy noting in a council, yet certainly the one half of his error is condemned for heresy in one of the four general councils, viz., the first council of Constantinople[h]: *αἱρετικοὺς δὲ λέγομεν τούς τε πάλαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποκηρυχθέντας, καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀναθεματισθέντας*, 'we call all them heretics whom the ancient church hath condemned, and whom we shall anathematize.' Will not Aërius come under one of these titles for a condemned heretic? Then see forward: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ τοὺς τὴν πίστιν μὲν τὴν ὑγιῆ προσποιουμένους ὁμολογεῖν, ἀποσχίσαντας δὲ καὶ ἀντισυνάγοντας τοῖς κανονικοῖς ἡμῶν ἐπισκόποις.* Here is enough for Aërius and all his hyperaspists, new and old; for the holy council condemns them for heretics, 'who do indeed confess the true faith, but separate from their bishops, and make conventicles apart from his communion.' Now this I the rather urge because an act of parliament made 1 of Elizabeth[i] does make this council, and the other three of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, the rule of judging heresies.

I end this particular with the saying of the council of Paris against the *Acephali* (who were the branch of a crab-stock, and something like Aërius) cited by Burchard[k], *Nulla ratione clerici aut sacerdotes habendi sunt, qui sub nullius episcopi disciplina et providentia gubernantur; tales enim Acephalos, id est, sine capite, priscæ ecclesiæ consuetudo nuncupavit*, 'they are by no means to be accounted clergymen or priests, that will not be governed by a bishop; for such men the primitive church called *ἀκεφάλους*, that is, headless, witless people.'

This only; Acephali was the title of a sect, a formal heresy, and condemned by the ancient church, say the fathers of the council of Paris. Now if we can learn exactly what they were, it may perhaps be another conviction for the necessity of episcopal regiment. Nicephorus[l] can best inform us. *Eodem tempore et Acephali, quorum dux Severus Antiochenus fuit, &c.* 'Severus of Antioch was the first broacher of this heresy.' But why were they called *Acephali? id est, sine capite, quod sequantur hæretici; nullus enim eorum reperitur auctor a quo exorti sunt*, saith Isidore[m]. But this cannot be, for their head is known; Severus was the heresiarch. But

[h] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 812.]

[i] [The High Commission court, established by the act alluded to, 1 Eliz. cap. 1, was abolished about the time that Taylor wrote this sentence, viz., in 1641, but its directions are still considered good in relation to heresy.]

[k] Decret., lib. ii. cap. 226. [p. 75 B. 8vo. Par. 1549.]

[l] Eccles. hist., lib. xviii. cap. 45. [tom. ii. p. 868 D.]

[m] Etymol., lib. viii. [append. x. cap. 61. tom. iii. p. 534.—The punctuation is that of the latest edition.]

then why are they called *Acephali?* Nicephorus gives this reason, and withal a very particular account of their heresy, *Acephali autem ob eam causam dicti sunt, quod sub episcopis non fuerunt,* 'they refused to live under bishops.' Thence they had their name; what was their heresy? They denied the distinction of natures in Christ. That was one of their heresies; but they had more; for they were *trium capitulorum in Chalcedone impugnatores,* saith Isidore[n], 'they opposed three canons of the council of Chalcedon.' One we have heard; what their other heresies were we do not so well know, but by the canon of the council of Paris, and the intimation of their name, we are guided to the knowledge of a second; they refused to live under the government of a bishop: and this also was *impugnatio unius articuli in Chalcedone,* for the eighth canon of the council of Chalcedon[o] commands that the clergy should be under episcopal government; but these Acephali would not, they were anti-episcopal men; and therefore they were condemned heretics, condemned in the councils of Paris, of Seville, and of Chalcedon.

But the more particular account that Nicephorus[p] gives of them, I will now insert, because it is of great use. *Proinde episcopis et sacerdotibus apud eos defunctis, neque baptismus juxta solennem et receptum ecclesiæ morem apud eos administratus, neque oblatio aut res aliqua divina facta, ministeriumve ecclesiasticum, sicuti mos est, celebratum est. Communionem vero illi a plurimo tempore asservatam habentes, feriis paschalibus in minutissimas incisam partes convenientibus ad se hominibus dederunt. Quo tempore quam quisque voluisset placitam sibi sumebat potestatem. Et propterea quod quilibet quod sibi visum esset fidei insertum volebat, quamplurima defectorum atque hæreticorum turba exorta est.* It is a story worthy of observation. 'When any bishop died, they would have no other consecrated in succession, and therefore could have no more priests when any of them died.' But how then did they to baptize their children? why, they were fain to make shift, and do it without any church solemnity. But how did they for the holy sacrament? for that could not be consecrated without a priest, and he not ordained without a bishop. True; but therefore 'they, while they had a bishop, got a great deal of bread consecrated, and kept a long time; and when Easter came cut it into small bits, or crumbs rather, to make it go the further, and gave it to their people.' And must we do so too? God forbid. But how did they when all that was gone? for crumbs would not last always. The story specifies it not, but yet I suppose they then got a bishop for their necessity, to help them to some more priests, and some more crumbs; for I find in the council of Seville[q] the fathers saying, *Ingressus est ad nos quidam ex*

[n] Ut supra. ['trium Chalcedonensium capitulorum,' ed.]
[o] [tom. ii. col. 603.]
[p] [Hist. eccl., lib. xviii. cap. 45. tom. ii. p. 869.]
[q] Can. xii. [tom. iii. col. 561.]

hæresi Acephalorum, . . episcopus[r]*;* they had then, it seems, got a bishop, but this they would seldom have, and never but when their necessity drave them to it. But was this all the inconvenience of the want of bishops? No, 'for every man,' saith Nicephorus, 'might do what he list, and if he had a mind to it might put his fancy into the creed, and thence came innumerable troops of schismatics and heretics.' So that this device was one simple heresy in the root, but it was forty heresies in the fruit and branches; clearly proving that want of bishops is the cause of all schism and recreant opinions that are imaginable.

I sum this up with the saying of St. Clement[s] the disciple of St. Peter, *Si autem vobis episcopis non obedierint omnes presbyteri, &c., [omnesque . .] tribus et linguæ non obtemperaverint, non solum infames, sed et extorres a regno Dei et consortio fidelium, ac a liminibus sancti Dei ecclesiæ alieni erunt,* 'all priests, and clergymen, and people, and nations, and languages, that do not obey their bishop, shall be shut forth of the communion of holy church here, and of heaven hereafter.' It runs high, but I cannot help it; I do but translate Ruffinus as he before translated St. Clement.

§ 48. And bishops were always, in the church men of great honour.

It seems then we must have bishops. But must we have 'lord bishops' too? That is the question now, but such an one as the primitive piety could never have imagined. For could they to whom bishops were placed in a right and a true light, they who believed and saw them to be the fathers of their souls, the guardian of their life and manners (as king Edgar[t] called St. Dunstan), the guide of their consciences, the instruments and conveyances of all the blessings heaven uses to pour upon us by the ministration of the holy gospel; would they that thought their lives a cheap exchange for a free and open communion with a catholic bishop, would they have contested upon an airy title, and the imaginary privilege of an honour which is far less than their spiritual dignity but infinitely less than the burden and charge of the souls of all their diocese? Charity thinks nothing too much, and that love is but little that grudges[u] at the good words a bishopric carries with it.

However, let us see whether titles of honour be either unfit in themselves to be given to bishops, or what the guise of christendom hath been in her spiritual heraldry.

1. St. Ignatius in his epistle to the church of Smyrna[v] gives them this command, *Honora episcopum ut principem sacerdotum, imaginem Dei referentem,* 'honour the bishop as the image of God, as the prince of priests.' Now since honour and excellency are terms of mutual relation, and all excellency that is in men and

[r] [leg. '(ut asserit ipse) episcopus.']
[s] Ep. iii. [Conc. Reg., tom. i. p. 113.]
[t] [In oratione pro monachatu propagando.—Spelman. concil., p. 478.]
[u] ['grutches,' edd.]
[v] [Interpol. § 9. p. 87.]

things is but a ray of divine excellency; so far as they participate of God, so far they are honourable. Since then the bishop carries the impress of God upon his forehead and bears God's image, certainly this participation of such perfection makes him very honourable. And since *honor est in honorante*, it is not enough that the bishop is honourable in himself, but it tells us our duty, we must honour him, we must do him honour; and of all the honours in the world that of words is the cheapest and the least.

St. Paul, speaking of the honour due to the prelates of the church, οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιώσθωσαν, 'let them be accounted worthy of double honour.' And one of the honours that he there means is a costly one, an honour of maintenance; the other must certainly be an honour of estimate, and that's cheapest. The council of Sardis[x], speaking of the several steps and capacities of promotion to the height of episcopacy, uses this expression, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄξιος τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης νομισθεὶς τῆς μεγίστης ἀπολαύσαι τιμῆς, 'he that shall be found worthy of so divine a priesthood, let him be advanced to the highest honour.' *Ego procidens ad pedes ejus rogabam, excusans me, et declinans honorem cathedræ et potestatem*, saith St. Clement[y] when St. Peter would have advanced him to the honour and power of the bishop's chair. But in the third epistle[z], speaking of the dignity of Aaron the high priest, and then by analogy of the bishop who although he be a minister in the order of Melchisedech, yet he hath also the honour of Aaron, *Omnis enim pontifex sacro chrismate perunctus, et in civitate constitutus, et in scripturis sacris conditus*[a], *carus et pretiosus hominibus oppido esse debet*, 'every high priest ordained in the city,' viz., a bishop, 'ought forthwith to be dear and precious in the eyes of men:' *quem quasi Christi locum tenentem honorare omnes debent, eique servire, et obedientes ad salutem suam fideliter existere, scientes quod sive honor sive injuria quæ ei defertur in Christum redundat et a Christo in Deum*, 'the bishop is Christ's vicegerent, and therefore he is to be obeyed, knowing that whether it be honour or injury that is done to the bishop, it is done to Christ, and so to God.' And indeed what is the saying of our blessed Saviour himself? "He that despiseth you despiseth Me." If bishops be God's ministers, and in higher order than the rest, then although all discountenance and disgrace done to the clergy reflect upon Christ, yet what is done to the bishop is far more: and then there is the same reason of the honour; and if so, then the question will prove but an odd one, even this, whether Christ be to be honoured or no, or depressed to the common estimate of vulgar people? for if the bishops be, then He is. This is the condition of the question.

2. Consider we that all religions, and particularly all christianity,

[x] Can. x. græc. [xiii. lat., tom. i. col. 646.]
[y] Epist. 1 ad Jacobum. [§ 3. Cotcler. tom. i. p. 617.]
[z] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 113.]
[a] [conject. 'eruditus.']

did give titles of honour to their high priests and bishops respectively. I shall not need to instance in the great honour of the priestly tribe among the Jews, and how highly honourable Aaron was in proportion. Prophets were called 'lords' in holy scripture[b]. "Art not thou my lord Elijah?" said Obadiah to the prophet. "Knowest thou not that God will take thy lord from thy head this day?" said the children in the prophet's schools; so it was then. And in the New testament we find a prophet honoured every where but in his own country: and to the apostles and presidents of churches[c] greater titles of honour given than was ever given to man by secular complacence and insinuation; 'angels,' and 'governors,' and 'fathers of our faith,' and 'stars,' 'lights of the world,' the 'crown of the church,' 'apostles of Jesus Christ,' nay, 'gods,' viz., to whom the word of God came; and of the compellation of 'apostles' particularly St. Hierome[d] saith, that when St. Paul called himself the 'apostle of Jesus Christ,' it was as magnifically spoken as if he had said, *præfectus prætorio Augusti Cæsaris, magister exercitus Tiberii imperatoris;* and yet bishops are apostles, and so called in scripture; I have proved that already.

Indeed our blessed Saviour in the case of the two sons of Zebedee, forbad them to expect by virtue of their apostolate any princely titles in order to a kingdom and an earthly principality; for that was it which the ambitious woman sought for her sons, viz., fair honour and dignity in an earthly kingdom; for such a kingdom they expected with their Messias. To this their expectation our Saviour's answer is a direct antithesis; and that made the apostles to be angry at the two petitioners as if they had meant to supplant the rest, and get the best preferment from them, to wit, in a temporal kingdom. 'No,' saith our blessed Saviour[e], 'ye are all deceived; the kings of the nations indeed do exercise authority, and are called εὐεργέται, benefactors,' (so the word signifies; 'gracious lords,' so we read it[f];) 'but it shall not be so with you.' What shall not be so with them? shall not they exercise authority? "Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord made ruler over His household?" Surely the apostles, or nobody. Had Christ authority? most certainly: then so had the apostles, for Christ gave them His, with a *sicut misit me Pater, &c.* Well, the apostles might, and we know they did exercise authority; what then 'shall not be so with them?' Shall not they be called εὐεργέται? Indeed if St. Mark had taken that title upon him in Alexandria, the Ptolomies, whose honorary appellative that was, would have questioned him highly for it: but if we go to the sense of the word, the apostles might be 'benefactors,'

[b] [vid. 1 Kings xviii. 7; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5.]

[c] [Apocal. i; 1 Cor. iv; John x. 35.]

[d] In Titum. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 409.]

[e] [Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42; Luke xxii. 25.]

[f] [viz., in Tyndale, 1534; Cranmer, 1539; Geneva, 1557.]

council of Carthage[h], *Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum, alioquin irrita erit sententia episcopi nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur.* Here is indeed a necessity of the presence of the clergy of his church where his consistory was kept, lest the sentence should be clandestine, and so illegal, but it is nothing but *præsentia clericorum,* for it is *sententia episcopi;* 'the bishop's sentence,' and 'the clerks' presence' only; for μόνος ὁ ἐντόπιος ἐπίσκοπος, 'the bishop alone' might give sentence in the causes of the inferior clergy, even by this canon itself, which is used for objection against the bishop's sole jurisdiction.

I know nothing now to hinder our process; for the bishop's jurisdiction is clearly left in his own hand, and the presbyters had no share in it but by delegation and voluntary assumption. Now I proceed in the main question.

§ 45. So that the government of the church by bishops was believed necessary.

We have seen what episcopacy is in itself, now from the same principles let us see what it is to us.

And first, antiquity taught us it was simply necessary, even to the being and constitution of a church: that runs high, but we must follow our leaders. St. Ignatius[i] is express in this question: *Qui intra altare est, mundus est, quare et obtemperat episcopo et sacerdotibus; qui vero foris est, hic is est qui sine episcopo, sacerdote, et diacono, quicquam agit, et ejusmodi inquinatam habet conscientiam, et infideli deterior est;* 'he that is within the altar,' that is, within the communion of the church, 'he is pure, for he obeys the bishop and the priests; but he that is without, that is, does any thing without his bishop and the clergy, he hath a filthy conscience, and is worse than an infidel;' *necesse itaque est quicquid facitis ut sine episcopo nihil faciatis,* 'it is necessary that whatever ye do ye be sure to do nothing without the bishop;' *quid enim aliud est episcopus, &c.,* 'for what else is a bishop but he that is greater than all power?' So that the obeying the bishop is the necessary condition of a christian and catholic communion, he that does not is worse than an infidel. The same also he affirms again[k], *Quotquot enim Christi, sunt partium episcopi; qui vero ab illo declinant, et cum maledictis communionem amplectuntur, hi cum illis excidentur;* 'all them that are on Christ's side are on the bishop's side, but they that communicate with accursed schismatics shall be cut off with them.' If then we will be Christ's servants, we must be obedient and subordinate to the bishop: it is the condition of christianity; we are not Christians else: so is the intimation of St. Ignatius.

As full and pertinent is the peremptory resolution of St. Cyprian

[h] Can. xxiii. [tom. i. col. 980.]
[i] Epist. [interpol.] ad Trall. [§ 7. p. 63.]
[k] Epist. [interpol.] ad Philadelph. [§ 3. p. 75.]

in that admirable epistle of his *ad Lapsos*[l], where after he had spoken how Christ instituted the honour of episcopacy in concrediting the keys to St. Peter and the other apostles, *Inde*, saith he, *per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur*, 'hence is it that by several successions of bishops the church is continued, so that the church hath its being or constitution by bishops, and every act of ecclesiastical regiment is to be disposed by them.' *Cum hoc itaque divina lege fundatum sit, miror, &c.*, 'since therefore this is so established by the law of God, I wonder any man should question it,' &c., and therefore as in all buildings the foundation being gone the fabric falls, so 'if ye take away bishops, the church must ask a writing of divorce from God, for it can no longer be called a church.' This account we have from St. Cyprian, and he reinforces again upon the same charge in his epistle *ad Florentium Pupianum*[m], where he makes a bishop to be ingredient into the definition of a church, *Ecclesia est plebs sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo grex adhærens*, 'the church is a flock adhering to its pastor, and a people united to their bishop;' for that so he means by *sacerdos* appears in the words subjoined, *Unde et scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo, et si qui cum episcopo non sit, in ecclesia non esse, et frustra sibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt, et latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt, &c.*, 'as a bishop is in the church, so the church is in the bishop, and he that does not communicate with the bishop is not in the church; and therefore they vainly flatter themselves that think their case fair and good if they communicate in conventicles and forsake their bishop.'

And for this cause the holy primitives were so confident and zealous for a bishop that they would rather expose themselves and all their tribes to a persecution than to the greater misery, the want of bishops. Fulgentius[n] tells an excellent story to this purpose. When Trasamund king of Byzac in Africa had made an edict that no more bishops should be consecrate, to this purpose that the catholic faith might expire (so he was sure it would if this device were perfected) *ut arescentibus truncis absque palmitibus omnes ecclesiæ desolarentur*, the good bishops of the province met together in a council, and having considered of the command of the tyrant, *Sacra turba pontificum qui remanserant communicato inter se consilio definierunt adversus præceptum regis in omnibus locis celebrare ordinationes pontificum, cogitantes aut regis iracundiam si qua forsan existeret mitigandam, quo facilius ordinati in suis plebibus viverent, aut si perse-*

[l] Epist. xxvii. [al. xxxiii. p. 66,] et alibi.

[m] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 168.]

[n] Vide Concil. Byzacenum, An. Dom. 504 [apud Baron. ubi infra,] et Surium, die 1 Januar. [tom. i. p. 32,] et Baron. in A.D. 504. [tom. vi. p. 562.—The narration is not by Fulgentius, but by the writer of his life in Surius, and was read by Taylor in Baronius.]

cutionis violentia nasceretur, coronandos etiam fidei confessione quos dignos inveniebant promotione: it was full of bravery and christian sprite; 'the bishops resolved, for all the edict against new ordination of bishops, to obey God rather than man, and to consecrate bishops in all places, hoping the king would be appeased; or if not, yet those whom they thought worthy of a mitre were in a fair disposition to receive a crown of martyrdom.' They did so; *fit repente communis assumptio,* and they all strived who should be first, and thought a blessing would outstrip the hindmost: they were sure they might go to heaven, though persecuted, under the conduct of a bishop; they knew without him the ordinary passage was obstructed.

Pius the first[o], bishop of Rome and martyr, speaking of them that calumniate and disgrace their bishops, endeavouring to make them infamous, 'they add,' saith he, 'evil to evil and grow worse,' *non intelligentes quod ecclesia Dei in sacerdotibus consistit, et crescit in templum Dei,* 'not considering that the church of God doth consist' or is established 'in bishops, and grows up to a holy temple.'

To him I am most willing to add St. Hierome[p], because he is often obtruded in defiance of the cause, *Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet,* 'the safety of the church depends upon the bishop's dignity.'

§ 46. For they are schismatics that separate from their bishop.

The reason which St. Hierome gives presses this business to a further particular; 'for if an eminent dignity and an unmatchable power be not given to him,' *tot efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes:* so that he makes bishops therefore necessary, because without them the unity of a church cannot be preserved; and we know that unity, and being, are of equal extent; and if the unity of the church depends upon the bishop, then where there is no bishop, no pretence to a church; and therefore to separate from the bishop makes a man at least a schismatic.

For unity, which the fathers press so often, they make to be dependent on the bishop. *Nihil sit in vobis quod possit vos dirimere, sed unimini episcopo, subjecti Deo per ipsum in Christo,* saith St. Ignatius[q], 'let nothing divide you, but be united to your bishop, being subject to God in Christ through your bishop.' And it is his *congé* to the people of Smyrna, to whom he writ in his epistle to Polycarpus[r], *Opto vos semper valere in Deo nostro Jesu Christo, in quo manete per unitatem Dei et episcopi*[s], 'farewell in Christ Jesus, in whom remain by the unity of God and of the bishop.' *Quanto vos beatiores judico, qui dependetis ab illo* (*episcopo*), *sic ut ecclesia a*

[o] Epist. ii. [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 228.]

[p] Advers. Lucifer., cap. 4. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 295.]

[q] Epist. [interpol.] ad Magnes. [§ 6. p. 55.]

[r] [§ 8. p. 42.]

[s] [ἐν ἑνότητι θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπῇ.—Coteler.]

Domino Jesu et Dominus a . . Patre suo, ut omnia per unitatem consentiant[t], 'blessed people are ye that depend upon your bishop, as the church on Christ, and Christ on God, that all things may consent in unity.'

Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt aut nata sunt schismata quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur[u], 'hence come schisms, hence spring heresies, that the bishop is not obeyed, and admitted alone to be the high priest, alone to be the judge.' The same St. Cyprian repeats again[x], and by it we may see his meaning clearer, *Qui audit vos, me audit, &c., inde enim hæreses et schismata oborta sunt et oriuntur, dum episcopus, qui unus est et ecclesiæ præest, superba quorundam præsumptione contemnitur, et homo dignatione Dei honoratus indignus ab hominibus judicatur*, 'the pride and peevish haughtiness of some factious people that contemn their bishops, is the cause of all heresy and schism.' And therefore it was so strictly forbidden by the ancient canons that any man should have any meetings or erect an altar out of the communion of his bishop, that if any man proved delinquent in this particular he was punished with the highest censures, as appears in the thirty-second canon of the apostles[y], in the sixth canon of the council of Gangra[z], the fifth canon of the council of Antioch[a], and the great council of Chalcedon[b], all which I have before cited.

The sum is this, the bishop is the band and ligature of the church's unity, and separation from the bishop is διχονοίας σύμβολον, as Theodoret's[c] expression is, 'a symbol of faction,' and he that separates is a schismatic.

But how if the bishop himself be a heretic or schismatic; may we not then separate? Yes, if he be judged so by a synod of bishops, but then he is sure to be deposed too, and then in these cases no separation from a bishop: for till he be declared so, his communion is not to be forsaken by the subjects of his diocese, lest they by so doing become their judge's judge; and when he is declared so, no need of withdrawing from obedience to the bishop, for the heretic or schismatic must be no longer bishop. But let the case be what it will be, no separation from a bishop, *ut sic*, can be lawful; and yet if there were a thousand cases in which it were lawful to separate from a bishop, yet in no case is it lawful to separate from episcopacy; that is the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow to christianity, and a confronting of a divine institution.

[t] Ad Ephes. [§ 5. p. 45.]
[u] St. Cyprian, ep. lv. [al. lix. p. 129.]
[x] Epist. lxix. [al. lxvi. p. 167.]
[y] [al. xxiv. p. 446.]
[z] [tom. i. col. 535.]
[a] [tom. i. col. 595.]
[b] Act. iv. [tom. ii. col. 433.]
[c] [Qu. Sozomen's? see p. 184. note e, above.]

§ 47. And heretics. But is it not also heresy? Aërius was condemned for heresy by the catholic church. The heresy from whence the Aërians were denominated was *sermo furiosus magis quam humanæ conditionis, et dicebat, Quid est episcopus ad presbyterum? nihil differt hic ab illo,* 'a mad and an unmanly heresy, to say that a bishop and a priest are all one,' so Epiphanius[d]: *assumpsit autem ecclesia, et in toto mundo assensus factus est, antequam esset Aërius, et qui ab ipso appellantur Aëriani:* and the good catholic father is so angry at the heretic Aërius that he thinks his name was given him by Providence, and he is called Aërius *ab aëriis spiritibus pravitatis,* for he was possessed with an unclean spirit; he could never else have been the inventor of such heretical pravity. St. Austin[e] also reckons him in the accursed roll of heretics, and adds at the conclusion of his catalogue, 'that he is no catholic Christian that assents to any of the foregoing doctrines;' amongst which this is one of the principal. Philastrius[f] does as much for him.

But against this it will be objected,

1) That heresies in the primitive catalogues are of a large extent, and every dissent from a public opinion was esteemed heresy;

2) Aërius was called heretic for denying prayer for the dead, and why may he not be as blameless in equalling a bishop and a presbyter, as in that other, for which he also is condemned by Epiphanius and St. Austin;

3) He was never condemned by any council; and how then can he be called heretic?—I answer,

1) That dissent from a public or a received opinion was never called heresy unless the contrary truth was indeed a part of catholic doctrine. For the fathers many of them did so, as St. Austin from the millenary opinion; yet none ever reckoned them in the catalogues of heretics, but such things only set them down there which were either directly opposite to catholic belief, though *in minoribus articulis,* or to a holy life.

2) It is true that Epiphanius and St. Austin reckon his denying prayer for the dead to be one of his own opinions, and heretical. But I cannot help it, if they did; let him and them agree it; they are able to answer for themselves. But yet they accused him also of Arianism; and shall we therefore say that Arianism was no heresy, because the fathers called him heretic in one particular upon a wrong principal[g]? We may as well say this as deny the other.

3) He was not condemned by any council. No, for his heresy was ridiculous, and a scorn to all wise men, as Epiphanius observes; and it made no long continuance, neither had it any considerable party. But yet this is certain, that Epiphanius, and Philastrius, and

[d] Hær. lxxv. [§§ 3, 6. pp. 906 D, 910 D.]
[e] [De hær. liii. tom. viii. col. 18 E.]
[f] [cap. 72. p. 140. 8vo Hamb. 1721.]
[g] [sic edd.]

St. Austin, called this opinion of Aërius a heresy, and against the catholic belief. And themselves affirm that the church did so; and then it would be considered, that it is but a sad employment to revive old heresies, and make them a piece of the new religion.

And yet after all this, if I mistake not, although Aërius himself was so inconsiderable as not to be worthy noting in a council, yet certainly the one half of his error is condemned for heresy in one of the four general councils, viz., the first council of Constantinople[h]: *αἱρετικοὺς δὲ λέγομεν τούς τε πάλαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποκηρυχθέντας, καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀναθεματισθέντας*, 'we call all them heretics whom the ancient church hath condemned, and whom we shall anathematize.' Will not Aërius come under one of these titles for a condemned heretic? Then see forward: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ τοὺς τὴν πίστιν μὲν τὴν ὑγιῆ προσποιουμένους ὁμολογεῖν, ἀποσχίσαντας δὲ καὶ ἀντισυνάγοντας τοῖς κανονικοῖς ἡμῶν ἐπισκόποις*. Here is enough for Aërius and all his hyperaspists, new and old; for the holy council condemns them for heretics, 'who do indeed confess the true faith, but separate from their bishops, and make conventicles apart from his communion.' Now this I the rather urge because an act of parliament made 1 of Elizabeth[i] does make this council, and the other three of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, the rule of judging heresies.

I end this particular with the saying of the council of Paris against the *Acephali* (who were the branch of a crab-stock, and something like Aërius) cited by Burchard[k], *Nulla ratione clerici aut sacerdotes habendi sunt, qui sub nullius episcopi disciplina et providentia gubernantur; tales enim Acephalos, id est, sine capite, priscæ ecclesiæ consuetudo nuncupavit*, 'they are by no means to be accounted clergymen or priests, that will not be governed by a bishop; for such men the primitive church called *ἀκεφάλους*, that is, headless, witless people.'

This only; Acephali was the title of a sect, a formal heresy, and condemned by the ancient church, say the fathers of the council of Paris. Now if we can learn exactly what they were, it may perhaps be another conviction for the necessity of episcopal regiment. Nicephorus[l] can best inform us. *Eodem tempore et Acephali, quorum dux Severus Antiochenus fuit, &c.* 'Severus of Antioch was the first broacher of this heresy.' But why were they called *Acephali? id est, sine capite, quod sequantur hæretici; nullus enim eorum reperitur auctor a quo exorti sunt*, saith Isidore[m]. But this cannot be, for their head is known; Severus was the heresiarch. But

[h] Can. vi. [tom. i. col. 812.]

[i] [The High Commission court, established by the act alluded to, 1 Eliz. cap. 1, was abolished about the time that Taylor wrote this sentence, viz., in 1641, but its directions are still considered good in relation to heresy.]

[k] Decret., lib. ii. cap. 226. [p. 75 B. 8vo. Par. 1549.]

[l] Eccles. hist., lib. xviii. cap. 45. [tom. ii. p. 868 D.]

[m] Etymol., lib. viii. [append. x. cap. 61. tom. iii. p. 534.—The punctuation is that of the latest edition.]

then why are they called *Acephali?* Nicephorus gives this reason, and withal a very particular account of their heresy, *Acephali autem ob eam causam dicti sunt, quod sub episcopis non fuerunt,* 'they refused to live under bishops.' Thence they had their name; what was their heresy? They denied the distinction of natures in Christ. That was one of their heresies; but they had more; for they were *trium capitulorum in Chalcedone impugnatores,* saith Isidore[n], 'they opposed three canons of the council of Chalcedon.' One we have heard; what their other heresies were we do not so well know, but by the canon of the council of Paris, and the intimation of their name, we are guided to the knowledge of a second; they refused to live under the government of a bishop: and this also was *impugnatio unius articuli in Chalcedone,* for the eighth canon of the council of Chalcedon[o] commands that the clergy should be under episcopal government; but these Acephali would not, they were anti-episcopal men; and therefore they were condemned heretics, condemned in the councils of Paris, of Seville, and of Chalcedon.

But the more particular account that Nicephorus[p] gives of them, I will now insert, because it is of great use. *Proinde episcopis et sacerdotibus apud eos defunctis, neque baptismus juxta solennem et receptum ecclesiæ morem apud eos administratus, neque oblatio aut res aliqua divina facta, ministeriumve ecclesiasticum, sicuti mos est, celebratum est. Communionem vero illi a plurimo tempore asservatam habentes, feriis paschalibus in minutissimas incisam partes convenientibus ad se hominibus dederunt. Quo tempore quam quisque voluisset placitam sibi sumebat potestatem. Et propterea quod quilibet quod sibi visum esset fidei insertum volebat, quamplurima defectorum atque hæreticorum turba exorta est.* It is a story worthy of observation. 'When any bishop died, they would have no other consecrated in succession, and therefore could have no more priests when any of them died.' But how then did they to baptize their children? why, they were fain to make shift, and do it without any church solemnity. But how did they for the holy sacrament? for that could not be consecrated without a priest, and he not ordained without a bishop. True; but therefore 'they, while they had a bishop, got a great deal of bread consecrated, and kept a long time; and when Easter came cut it into small bits, or crumbs rather, to make it go the further, and gave it to their people.' And must we do so too? God forbid. But how did they when all that was gone? for crumbs would not last always. The story specifies it not, but yet I suppose they then got a bishop for their necessity, to help them to some more priests, and some more crumbs; for I find in the council of Seville[q] the fathers saying, *Ingressus est ad nos quidam ex*

[n] Ut supra. ['trium Chalcedonensium capitulorum,' ed.]

[o] [tom. ii. col. 603.]

[p] [Hist. eccl., lib. xviii. cap. 45. tom. ii. p. 869.]

[q] Can. xii. [tom. iii. col. 561.]

hæresi Acephalorum, . . episcopus[r]*;* they had then, it seems, got a bishop, but this they would seldom have, and never but when their necessity drave them to it. But was this all the inconvenience of the want of bishops? No, 'for every man,' saith Nicephorus, 'might do what he list, and if he had a mind to it might put his fancy into the creed, and thence came innumerable troops of schismatics and heretics.' So that this device was one simple heresy in the root, but it was forty heresies in the fruit and branches; clearly proving that want of bishops is the cause of all schism and recreant opinions that are imaginable.

I sum this up with the saying of St. Clement[s] the disciple of St. Peter, *Si autem vobis episcopis non obedierint omnes presbyteri, &c., [omnesque . .] tribus et linguæ non obtemperaverint, non solum infames, sed et extorres a regno Dei et consortio fidelium, ac a liminibus sancti Dei ecclesiæ alieni erunt,* 'all priests, and clergymen, and people, and nations, and languages, that do not obey their bishop, shall be shut forth of the communion of holy church here, and of heaven hereafter.' It runs high, but I cannot help it; I do but translate Ruffinus as he before translated St. Clement.

§ 48. And bishops were always, in the church men of great honour.

It seems then we must have bishops. But must we have 'lord bishops' too? That is the question now, but such an one as the primitive piety could never have imagined. For could they to whom bishops were placed in a right and a true light, they who believed and saw them to be the fathers of their souls, the guardian of their life and manners (as king Edgar[t] called St. Dunstan), the guide of their consciences, the instruments and conveyances of all the blessings heaven uses to pour upon us by the ministration of the holy gospel; would they that thought their lives a cheap exchange for a free and open communion with a catholic bishop, would they have contested upon an airy title, and the imaginary privilege of an honour which is far less than their spiritual dignity but infinitely less than the burden and charge of the souls of all their diocese? Charity thinks nothing too much, and that love is but little that grudges[u] at the good words a bishopric carries with it.

However, let us see whether titles of honour be either unfit in themselves to be given to bishops, or what the guise of christendom hath been in her spiritual heraldry.

1. St. Ignatius in his epistle to the church of Smyrna[v] gives them this command, *Honora episcopum ut principem sacerdotum, imaginem Dei referentem,* 'honour the bishop as the image of God, as the prince of priests.' Now since honour and excellency are terms of mutual relation, and all excellency that is in men and

[r] [leg. '(ut asserit ipse) episcopus.']
[s] Ep. iii. [Conc. Reg., tom. i. p. 113.]
[t] [In oratione pro monachatu propagando.—Spelman. concil., p. 478.]
[u] ['grutches,' edd.]
[v] [Interpol. § 9. p. 87.]

things is but a ray of divine excellency; so far as they participate of God, so far they are honourable. Since then the bishop carries the impress of God upon his forehead and bears God's image, certainly this participation of such perfection makes him very honourable. And since *honor est in honorante*, it is not enough that the bishop is honourable in himself, but it tells us our duty, we must honour him, we must do him honour; and of all the honours in the world that of words is the cheapest and the least.

St. Paul, speaking of the honour due to the prelates of the church, οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιώσθωσαν, 'let them be accounted worthy of double honour.' And one of the honours that he there means is a costly one, an honour of maintenance; the other must certainly be an honour of estimate, and that's cheapest. The council of Sardis[x], speaking of the several steps and capacities of promotion to the height of episcopacy, uses this expression, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄξιος τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης νομισθεὶς τῆς μεγίστης ἀπολαύσαι τιμῆς, 'he that shall be found worthy of so divine a priesthood, let him be advanced to the highest honour.' *Ego procidens ad pedes ejus rogabam, excusans me, et declinans honorem cathedræ et potestatem*, saith St. Clement[y] when St. Peter would have advanced him to the honour and power of the bishop's chair. But in the third epistle[z], speaking of the dignity of Aaron the high priest, and then by analogy of the bishop who although he be a minister in the order of Melchisedech, yet he hath also the honour of Aaron, *Omnis enim pontifex sacro chrismate perunctus, et in civitate constitutus, et in scripturis sacris conditus*[a], *carus et pretiosus hominibus oppido esse debet*, 'every high priest ordained in the city,' viz., a bishop, 'ought forthwith to be dear and precious in the eyes of men:' *quem quasi Christi locum tenentem honorare omnes debent, eique servire, et obedientes ad salutem suam fideliter existere, scientes quod sive honor sive injuria quæ ei defertur in Christum redundat et a Christo in Deum*, 'the bishop is Christ's vicegerent, and therefore he is to be obeyed, knowing that whether it be honour or injury that is done to the bishop, it is done to Christ, and so to God.' And indeed what is the saying of our blessed Saviour himself? "He that despiseth you despiseth Me." If bishops be God's ministers, and in higher order than the rest, then although all discountenance and disgrace done to the clergy reflect upon Christ, yet what is done to the bishop is far more: and then there is the same reason of the honour; and if so, then the question will prove but an odd one, even this, whether Christ be to be honoured or no, or depressed to the common estimate of vulgar people? for if the bishops be, then He is. This is the condition of the question.

2. Consider we that all religions, and particularly all christianity,

[x] Can. x. græc. [xiii. lat., tom. i. col. 646.]

[y] Epist. 1 ad Jacobum. [§ 3. Coteler. tom. i. p. 617.]

[z] [Concil. Reg., tom. i. p. 113.]

[a] [conject. 'eruditus.']

did give titles of honour to their high priests and bishops respectively. I shall not need to instance in the great honour of the priestly tribe among the Jews, and how highly honourable Aaron was in proportion. Prophets were called 'lords' in holy scripture[b]. "Art not thou my lord Elijah?" said Obadiah to the prophet. "Knowest thou not that God will take thy lord from thy head this day?" said the children in the prophet's schools; so it was then. And in the New testament we find a prophet honoured every where but in his own country: and to the apostles and presidents of churches[c] greater titles of honour given than was ever given to man by secular complacence and insinuation; 'angels,' and 'governors,' and 'fathers of our faith,' and 'stars,' 'lights of the world,' the 'crown of the church,' 'apostles of Jesus Christ,' nay, 'gods,' viz., to whom the word of God came; and of the compellation of 'apostles' particularly St. Hierome[d] saith, that when St. Paul called himself the 'apostle of Jesus Christ,' it was as magnifically spoken as if he had said, *præfectus prætorio Augusti Cæsaris, magister exercitus Tiberii imperatoris;* and yet bishops are apostles, and so called in scripture; I have proved that already.

Indeed our blessed Saviour in the case of the two sons of Zebedee, forbad them to expect by virtue of their apostolate any princely titles in order to a kingdom and an earthly principality; for that was it which the ambitious woman sought for her sons, viz., fair honour and dignity in an earthly kingdom; for such a kingdom they expected with their Messias. To this their expectation our Saviour's answer is a direct antithesis; and that made the apostles to be angry at the two petitioners as if they had meant to supplant the rest, and get the best preferment from them, to wit, in a temporal kingdom. 'No,' saith our blessed Saviour[e], 'ye are all deceived; the kings of the nations indeed do exercise authority, and are called εὐεργέται, benefactors,' (so the word signifies; 'gracious lords,' so we read it[f];) 'but it shall not be so with you.' What shall not be so with them? shall not they exercise authority? "Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord made ruler over His household?" Surely the apostles, or nobody. Had Christ authority? most certainly: then so had the apostles, for Christ gave them His, with *sicut misit me Pater, &c.* Well, the apostles might, and we know they did exercise authority; what then 'shall not be so with them?' Shall not they be called εὐεργέται? Indeed if St. Mark had taken that title upon him in Alexandria, the Ptolomies, whose honorary appellative that was, would have questioned him highly for it: but if we go to the sense of the word, the apostles might be 'benefactors,'

[b] [vid. 1 Kings xviii. 7; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5.]

[c] [Apocal. i; 1 Cor. iv; John x. 35.]

[d] In Titum. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 409.]

[e] [Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42; Luke xxii. 25.]

[f] [viz., in Tyndale, 1534; Cranmer, 1539; Geneva, 1557.]

and therefore might be called so; but what then? might they not be called 'gracious lords?' the word would have done no hurt, if it had not been an ensign of a secular principality.

For as for the word 'lord,' I know no more prohibition for that than for being called *rabbi*, or master, or doctor, or father[g]. What shall we think now? may we not be called doctors? "God hath constituted in His church pastors and doctors," saith St. Paul[h], therefore we may be called so. But what of the other? the prohibition runs alike for all, as is evident in the several places of the gospels, and may no man be called master, or father? Let an answer be thought upon for these, and the same will serve for the other also without any sensible error. It is not the word, it is the ambitious seeking of a temporal principality as the issue of christianity and an affix of the apostolate, that Christ interdicted His apostles. And if we mark it, our blessed Saviour points it out Himself: 'the princes of the nations κατακυριεύουσιν, exercise authority over them, and are called benefactors; οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, it shall not be so with you.' Not so? how? Not as the princes of the gentiles, for theirs is a temporal regiment, your apostolate must be spiritual. They rule as kings, you as fellow servants, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔστω ὑμῶν δοῦλος, 'he that will be first amongst you, let him be your minister, or servant;' it seems then among Christ's disciples there may be a superiority, when there is a minister or servant; but it must be ἐν τῷ διακονεῖν that this greatness doth consist, it must be in doing the greatest 'service and ministration' that the superiority consists in. But more particularly, it must be ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· it must not be 'as the princes of the gentiles,' but it must be 'as the Son of man,' so Christ says expressly[i]; and how was that? why, He 'came to minister and to serve,' and yet in the lowest act of His humility, the washing His disciples' feet, He told them, "Ye call Me Lord and Master, and ye say well, for so I am[k]." It may be 'so with you;' nay, it must be 'as the Son of man;' but then the being called *rabbi* or lord, nay, the being lord *in spirituali magisterio et regimine*, 'in a spiritual superintendency,' and ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, may stand with the humility of the gospel, and office of ministration.

So that now I shall not need to take advantage of the word κατακυριεύουσιν[l], which signifies to rule with more than a political regiment, even with an absolute and despotic, and is so used in holy scripture, viz., *in sequiorem partem*. God gave authority to man over the creatures; κατακυριεύσατε is the word in the Septuagint[m], and we know the power that man hath over beasts is to kill and to keep alive. And thus to our blessed Saviour, the power that God gave Him over His enemies is expressed by κατακυριεύειν· κατακυ-

[g] [Matt. xxiii. 8—10.]
[h] [Eph. iv. 11.]
[i] [Luke xxii. 25.]
[k] [John xiii. 13.]
[l] In locis ubi supra.
[m] [Gen. i. 28.]

ρίενε ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου[n]· and this we know how it must be exercised, ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ 'with a rod of iron;' ὡς σκεῦος κεραμέως συντρίψεις αὐτοὺς[o], He 'shall break them in pieces like a potter's vessel:' that's κατακυριεύειν, but 'it shall not be so with you.'

But let this be as true as it will; the answer needs no way to rely upon a criticism; it is clear that the form of regiment only is distinguished, not all regiment and authority taken away: οὐχ οὕτως, but ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς, 'not as the kings of the gentiles but as the Son of man,' so must your regiment be, for *sicut misit me Pater, &c.*, 'as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you;' it must be a government, not for your impery, but for the service of the church; so that it is not for your advancement but the public ministry, that you are put to rule over the household. And thus the fathers express the authority and regiment of bishops. *Qui vocatur ad episcopatum non ad principatum vocatur sed ad servitutem totius ecclesiæ,* saith Origen[p]. And St. Hierome[q], *Episcopi sacerdotes se esse noverint, non dominos;* and yet St. Hierome[r] himself writing to St. Austin calls him, *Domine vere sancte et suscipiende papa. Forma apostolica hæc est, dominatio interdicitur, indicitur ministratio*[s]; it is no principality that the apostles have, but it is a ministry; a ministry in chief, the officers of which ministration must govern, and we must obey: they must govern not in a temporal regiment by virtue of their episcopacy, but in a spiritual; not for honour to the rulers so much as for benefit and service to the subject. So St. Austin[t], *Nomen est operis, non honoris, . . ut intelligat non se esse episcopum qui præesse dilexerit, non prodesse;* and in the fourteenth chapter of the same book, *Qui imperant serviunt iis rebus quibus videntur imperare; non enim dominandi cupidine imperant, sed officio consulendi; nec principandi superbia, sed providendi misericordia.* And all this is intimated in the prophetical visions, where the regiment of Christ is designed by the face of a man, and the empire of the world by beasts; the first is the regiment of a father, the second of a king; the first spiritual, the other secular. And of the fatherly authority it is that the prophet says[u], 'Instead of fathers thou shalt have children, whom thou mayest make princes in all lands;' this, say the fathers, is spoken of the apostles and their successors the bishops, who may be ἄρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν, 'princes or rulers of churches,' not princes of kingdoms, by virtue or challenge of their apostolate.—But if this ecclesiastical rule or chiefty be interdicted, I wonder how the presidents of the presbyters, the προεστῶτες in the reformed churches,

[n] [Ps. cx. 2.]
[o] [Ps. ii. 9.]
[p] Hom. vi. in Esai. [§ 1. tom. iii. p. 116 E.]
[q] ['Episcopi patres se sciant esse, non dominos.'—S. Hieron. ep. xxxix. ad Theophil., tom. iv. part. 2. col. 339.]
[r] [Ep. lxvi. (tom. iv. part. 2. col. 604) et alibi.]
[s] S. Bernard. de Considerat. [lib. ii. cap. 6. col. 869 E.]
[t] De civ. Dei, lib. xix. cap. 19. [tom. vii. col. 563 D.]
[u] [Ps. xlv. 17.]

will acquit themselves? how will their superiority be reconciled to the place, though it be but temporary? For is it a sin if it continues, and no sin if it lasts but for a week? or is it lawful to sin, and domineer and lord it over their brethren, for a week together? But suppose it were, what will they say that are perpetual dictators? Calvin was perpetual president, and Beza till Danæus came to Geneva, even for many years together. But beyond all this, how can the presbytery, which is a fixed lasting body, rule and govern in causes spiritual and consistorial, and that over all princes, and ministers, and people, and that for ever? For is it a sin in episcopacy to do so, and not in the presbytery? If it be lawful here, then Christ did not interdict it to the apostles; for who will think that a presbytery shall have leave to domineer, and (as they call it now-a-days) to 'lord' it over their brethren, when a college of apostles shall not be suffered to 'govern?' But if the apostles may govern, then we are brought to a right understanding of our Saviour's saying to the sons of Zebedee, and then also their successors the bishops may do the same.

If I had any further need of answer or escape, it were easy to pretend that this being a particular directory to the apostles was to expire with their persons; so St. Cyprian[y] intimates, *Apostoli pari fuere consortio præditi et honoris et dignitatis.* And indeed this may be concluding against the supremacy of St. Peter's successors, but will be no ways pertinent to impugn episcopal authority; for *inter se* they might be equal, and yet superior to the presbyters and the people.

Lastly; "It shall not be so with you," so Christ said, *non designando officium,* but *sortem,* 'not their duty but their lot;' intimating that their future condition should not be honorary but full of trouble, not advanced but persecuted. But I had rather insist on the first answer; in which I desire it be remembered that I said seeking temporal principality to be forbidden the apostles 'as an appendix to the office of an apostle.' For in other capacities bishops are as receptive of honour and temporal principalities as other men. Bishops, *ut sic,* are not secular princes, must not seek for it; but some secular princes may be bishops, as in Germany and in other places to this day they are. For it is as unlawful for a bishop to have any land as to have a country, and a single acre is no more due to the order than a province; but both these may be conjunct in the same person, though still by virtue of Christ's precept the functions and capacities must be distinguished; according to the saying of Synesius[z], Συνάπτειν τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ συγκλώθειν ἐστὶ τὰ ἀσύγκλωστα, 'to confound and intermix the kingdom and the priesthood is to join things incompossible and inconsistent;' inconsistent, I say, not in person, but absolutely discrepant in function.

3. Consider we that St. Peter, when he speaks of the duteous sub-

[y] De unit. eccles. [p. 107.] [z] [vid. epist. lvii. p. 198 C.]

ordination of Sarah to her husband Abraham, he propounds her as an example to all married women in these words[y], "She obeyed Abraham, and called him lord:" why was this spoken to christian women but that they should do so too? And is it imaginable that such an honourable compellation as Christ allows every woman to give to her husband, a mechanic, a hard-handed artisan, He would forbid to those eminent pillars of His church, those lights of christendom whom He really endued with a plenitude of power for the regiment of the catholic church? *Credat Apella.*

4. Pastor and father are as honourable titles as any: they are honourable in scripture; 'honour thy father,' &c., thy father in all senses; they are also made sacred by being the appellatives of kings and bishops, and that not only in secular addresses but even in holy scripture, as is known. Add to this, ἡγούμενοι, προεστῶτες, and προϊστάμενοι, are used in scripture[z] for the prelates of the church, and I am certain that 'duke' and 'captain,' 'rulers' and 'commanders,' are but just the same in English that the other are in Greek, and the least of these is as much as κύριος, or 'lord.' And then if we consider that since Christ erected a spiritual regiment, and used words of secular honour to express it, as in the instances above, although Christ did interdict a secular principality, yet He forbad not a secular title; He used many himself.

5. The voice of the spouse, the holy church, hath always expressed their honourable estimate in reverential compellations and epithets of honour to their bishops, and have taught us so to do. Bishops were called *principes ecclesiarum,* 'princes of the churches.' I had occasion to instance it in the question of jurisdiction. Indeed the third council of Carthage[a] forbad the bishop of Carthage to be called *princeps sacerdotum,* or *summus sacerdos,* or *aliquid hujusmodi,* but only *primæ sedis episcopus.* I know not what their meaning was, unless they would dictate a lesson of humility to their primate, that he might remember the principality not to be so much in his person as in the see, for he might be called 'bishop of the prime see.' But whatsoever fancy they had at Carthage, I am sure it was a guise of christendom not to speak of bishops *sine præfatione honoris,* 'but with honourable mention.' Τῷ κυρίῳ μακαριωτάτῳ, 'to our most blessed lord,' so the letters were superscribed to Julius bishop of Rome from some of his brethren, in Sozomen[b]. 'Let no man speak untruths of me, μηδὲ τῶν κυρίων τῶν ἐπισκόπων, nor of my lords the bishops,' said St. Gregory Nazianzen[c]. The synodical book of the council of Constantinople[d] is inscribed *Dominis reverendissimis ac piissimis fratribus ac collegis, Damaso, Ambrosio, &c.* 'to our most reverend lords and holy brethren,' &c. And the council of Illy-

[y] [1 Pet. iii. 6.]
[z] [Acts xv. 22; Rom. xii. 8; Heb. xiii. 7.]
[a] [can. xxvi. tom. i. col. 964.]
[b] Lib. iii. [cap. 23.]
[c] Epist. [clxxxii.] ad Greg. Nyssen. [tom. ii. p. 149 A.]
[d] Theodoret., lib. v. [cap. 9.]

ricum[e] sending their synodal letters to the bishops of Asia by bishop Elpidius, *Hæc pluribus*, say they, *persequi non est visum, quod misimus unum ex omnibus dominum et collegam nostrum Elpidium, qui cognosceret essetne sicut dictum fuerat a domino et collega nostro Eustatkio;* 'our lord and brother Elpidius,' 'our lord and brother Eustathius.' The oration in the council of Epaunum[f] begins thus, *Quod præcipientibus tantis dominis meis ministerium proferendi sermonis assumo, &c.* the prolocutor took that office on him 'at the command of so many great lords the bishops.' When the church of Spain became catholic and abjured the Arian heresy, king Recaredus[g] in the third council of Toledo made a speech to the bishops, *Non incognitum reor esse vobis, reverendissimi sacerdotes, &c. Non credimus vestram latere sanctitatem, &c. Vestra cognovit beatitudo, &c. Venerandi patres, &c.*, and these often; 'your holiness,' 'your blessedness,' 'most reverend,' 'venerable fathers;' those were the addresses the king made to the fathers of the synod. Thus it was when Spain grew catholic, but not such a speech to be found in all the Arian records; they amongst them used but little reverence to their bishops.—But the instances of this kind are innumerable; nothing more ordinary in antiquity[h] than to speak of bishops with the titles of κύριοι τιμιώτατοι, θεοφιλέστατοι, ἁγιώτατοι· *domine vere sancte et suscipiende papa,* so St. Hierome[i] a presbyter to St. Austin a bishop. *Secundum enim honorum vocabula quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit episcopatus presbyterio major est,* saith St. Austin[j], 'episcopacy is greater than the office and dignity of a presbyter, according to the titles of honour which the custom of the church hath introduced.' But I shall sum up these particulars in a total, which is thus expressed by St. Chrysostom[k]; *Hæretici a diabolo honorum vocabula episcopis non dare didicerunt,* 'heretics have learned of the devil not to give due titles of honour to bishops.' The good patriarch was surely angry when he said so: for my own particular, I am confident that my lords the bishops do so undervalue any fastuous or pompous title, that were not the duty of their people in it, they would as easily reject them as it is our duties piously to use them. But if they still desire appellatives of honour, we must give them, they are their due; if they desire them not, they deserve them much more: so that either for their humility, or however, for their works' sake, we must "highly honour them that have the rule over us," it is the precept of St. Paul[l]. And St. Cyprian[m], observing how curious our blessed Saviour was that He might give honour to the priests of the Jews, even then when

[e] Theodoret., lib. iv. cap. 9. [al. 8.—Harduin. concil., tom. iii. p. 962.]
[f] [tom. ii. col. 1047.]
[g] [tom. iii. col. 468 E, 469 B.]
[h] Theodoret., lib. i. capp. 4, 5, [init. pp. 9, 22.] Athan. apol. ii. [Ben. 'Apol. contr. Arianos,' § 77. tom. i. p. 193 D.]
[i] [Ep. lxvi. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 604.]
[j] Ep. xvii. xviii. xix. apud S. Aug. [Ben. xxxix. lxxxi. lxxxii. cap. iv. § 33. tom. ii. coll. 84 A, 189, 202 F.]
[k] In psalm. xiii. apud Baron. in An. Dom. lviii. n. 2. [tom. i. p. 521.]
[l] [1 Thess. v. 13.]
[m] Epist. lxv. [al. iii. p. 6.]

they were reeking in their malice, hot as the fire of hell, "He did it to teach us a duty," *docuit enim sacerdotes veros legitime et plene honorari, dum circa falsos sacerdotes ipse talis extitit;* it is the argument he uses to procure a full honour to the bishop.

To these I add,—If sitting in a throne even above the seat of elders be a title of a great dignity, then we have it confirmed by the voice of all antiquity, calling the bishop's chair a throne, and the investiture of a bishop in his church, an enthronization. *Quando inthronizantur propter communem utilitatem episcopi, &c.*, saith P. Anterus[n], in his decretal epistle to the bishops of Bœtica and Toledo. 'Enthroning' is the primitive word for the consecration of a bishop; *Sedes in episcoporum ecclesiis excelse constitutæ et præparatæ . . ut thronus, speculationem et potestatem judicandi . . a Domino sibi datam materiam docent,* saith Urban[o]. And St. Ignatius[p] to his deacon Hero, πιστεύω γὰρ εἰς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ὅτι δείξει μοι ὁ Θεὸς Ἥρωνα ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου μου, 'I trust that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ will shew to me Hero sitting upon my throne.'

The sum of all is this. Bishops, if they must be at all, most certainly must be beloved; it is our duties, and their work deserves it. St. Paul was as dear to the Galatians as their eyes, and it is true eternally, *Formosi pedes evangelizantium,* 'the feet of the preachers of the gospel are beauteous,' and then much more of the chief. *Ideo ista prætulimus, carissimi, ut intelligatis potestatem episcoporum vestrorum, in eisque Deum veneremini, et eos ut animas vestras diligatis, ut quibus illi non communicant, non communicetis*[q], *&c.* Now love to our superiors is ever honourable; for it is more than *amicitia;* that's amongst peers, but love to our betters is reverence, obedience, and high estimate, and if we have the one the dispute about the other would be a mere impertinence.—I end this with the saying of St. Ignatius, *Et vos decet non contemnere ætatem episcopi, sed juxta Dei Patris arbitrium omnem illi impertiri reverentiam*[r], 'it is the will of God the Father that we should give all reverence, honour, or veneration to our bishops.'

§ 49. And trusted with affairs of secular interest.

Well, however things are now, it was otherwise in the old religion, for no honour was thought too great for them whom God had honoured with so great degrees of approximation to Himself in power and authority. But then also they went further; for they thought whom God had intrusted with their souls, they might with an equal con-

[n] [Concil. Harduin., tom. i. col. 120.]
[o] Epist. decret. [cap. iv.—Concil. Bin., tom. i. p. 88 F.]
[p] Epist. [supposit.] ad Heron. [§ 7. p. 110.]
[q] Urban. [ut in not. o, supra.]
[r] Epist. [interpol.] ad Magnes. [§ 3. p. 53.]

fidence trust with their personal actions and employments of greatest trust.

For it was great consideration that they who were *antistites religionis*, the doctors and great dictators of faith and conscience, should be the composers of those affairs in whose determination a divine wisdom, and interests of conscience, and the authority of religion, were the best ingredients.

But it is worth observing how the church and the commonwealth did actions contrary to each other in pursuance of their several interests. The commonwealth still enabled bishops to take cognizance of causes, and the confidence of their own people would be sure to carry them thither where they hoped for fair issue, upon such good grounds as they might fairly expect from the bishops' abilities, authority, and religion: but on the other side the church did as much decline them as she could, and made sanctions against it, so far as she might, without taking from themselves all opportunities both of doing good to their people and engaging the secular arm to their own assistance. But this we shall see by consideration of particulars.

1. It was not *in natura rei* unlawful for bishops to receive an office of secular employment. St. Paul's tent-making was as much against the calling of an apostle as sitting in a secular tribunal is against the office of a bishop; and it is hard if we will not allow that to the conveniences of a republic, which must be indulged to a private, personal necessity. But we have not St. Paul's example only, but his rule too, according to primitive exposition[s]; "Dare any of you having a matter before[t] another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church." Who are they? the clergy, I am sure, now-a-days. But St. Ambrose[u] also thought that to be his meaning seriously, "let the ministers of the church be the judges." For by 'least esteemed' he could not mean the most ignorant of the laity; they would most certainly have done very strange justice, especially in such causes which they understand not: no, but set them to judge who by their office are servants and ministers of all; and those are the clergy, who, as St. Paul's expression is, 'preach not themselves, but Jesus to be[v] the Lord, and themselves your servants for Jesus' sake:' *melius dicit apud Dei ministros agere causam.*

Yea, but St. Paul's expression seems to exclude the governors of the church from intermeddling, "Is there not one wise man among you that is able to judge between his brethren?" why 'brethren,' if bishops and priests were to be the judges; they are 'fathers.'—The objection is not worth the noting but only for St. Ambrose his answer

[s] [1 Cor. vi. 1.]
[t] [leg. 'against.']
[u] In hunc locum. [tom. ii. append. col. 129 B.]
[v] [So Tyndale, 1534, and Cranmer, 1539.]

to it, *Ideo autem fratrem judicem eligendum dicit quia adhuc rector ecclesiæ illorum non erat ordinatus,* 'S. Paul used the word 'brethren,' for as yet a bishop was not ordained amongst them of that church;' intimating that the bishop was to be the man, though till then *in subsidium* any prudent christian man might be employed[w].

2. The church did always forbid to clergymen a voluntary assumption of engagements *in rebus sæculi.* So the sixth[x] canon of the apostles, ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος κοσμικὰς φροντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβανέτω· εἰ δὲ μὴ, καθαιρείσθω· 'a bishop, and a priest, and a deacon, must not assume or take on himself worldly cares; if he does, let him be deposed.' Here the prohibition is general, 'no worldly cares;' not domestic. But how if they come on him by divine imposition, or accident? that's nothing, if he does not assume them, that is, by his voluntary act acquire his own trouble; so that if his secular employment be an act of obedience, indeed it is trouble to him, but no sin; but if he seeks it for itself, it is ambition. In this sense also must the following canon be understood, κληρικὸς ἐγγύας διδοὺς καθαιρείσθω, 'a clerk must not be a tutor or guardian,' viz., of secular trust, that is, must not seek a diversion from his employment by voluntary tutorship.

3. The church also forbade all secular negotiation for base ends, not precisely the employment itself, but the illness of the intention; and this indeed she expressly forbids in her canons[y]. *Pervenit ad sanctam synodum quod quidam qui in clero sunt allecti propter lucra turpia conductores alienarum possessionum fiant, et sæcularia negotia sub cura sua suscipiunt, Dei quidem ministerium parvi pendentes, sæcularium vero discurrentes domos, et propter avaritiam patrimoniorum sollicitudinem sumentes,* 'clergymen were farmers of lands, and did take upon them secular employment for covetous designs, and with neglect of the church.' These are the things the council complained of, and therefore according to this exigence the following sanction is to be understood, *Decrevit itaque sanctum hoc magnumque concilium, nullum deinceps, non episcopum, non clericum, vel monachum, aut possessiones conducere, aut negotiis sæcularibus se immiscere,* 'no bishop, no clergyman, no monk, must farm grounds, nor engage himself in secular business.' What, in none? no, none, *præter pupillorum, si forte leges imponant inexcusabilem curam, aut civitatis episcopus ecclesiasticarum rerum sollicitudinem habere præcipiat, aut orphanorum et viduarum, earum quæ sine ulla defensione sunt, ac personarum quæ maxime ecclesiastico indigent adjutorio, et propter timorem Domini causa deposcat.* This canon will do right to the question. 1) All secular affairs and bargains, either for covetousness or with considerable disturbance of church offices, are to be

[w] Vide etiam August. De opere monach., cap. xxix. [tom. vi. col. 499.]

[x] Can. vii. latin. Vide Zonar. in can. apostol., [p. 4.]

[y] Concil. Chalced. act. xv. can. 3. [tom. ii. col. 602.]

avoided; for a clergyman must not be covetous, much less for covetise must he neglect his cure. To this purpose is that of the second council of Arles[z], *Clericus turpis lucri gratia aliquod genus negotiationis non exerceat.* But nor[a] here nor at Chalcedon is the prohibition absolute, nor declaratory of an inconsistence and incapacity; for, for all this, the bishop or clerk may do any office that is *in pia curia*[b]. He may undertake the supravision of widows and orphans. 2) And although he be forbid by the canon of the apostles to be 'a guardian of pupils,' yet it is expounded here by this canon of Chalcedon for a voluntary seeking; it is forbidden by the apostles, but here it is permitted only with *si forte leges imponant,* 'if the law or authority commands him,' then he may undertake it: that is, if either the emperor commands him or if the bishop permits him, then it is lawful, but without such command or license it was against the canon of the apostles. And therefore S. Cyprian[c] did himself severely punish Geminius Faustinus, one of the priests of Carthage, for undertaking the executorship of the testament of Geminius Victor: he had no leave of his bishop so to do, and for him of his own head to undertake that which would be an avocation of him from his office, did in S. Cyprian's consistory deserve a censure. 3) By this canon of Chalcedon any clerk may be the *œconomus* or steward of a church and dispense her revenue, if the bishop command him. 4) He may undertake the patronage or assistance of any distressed person that needs the church's aid.—From hence it is evident that all secular employment did not *hoc ipso* avocate a clergyman from his necessary office and duty, for some secular employments are permitted him; 'all causes of piety, of charity, all occurrences concerning the revenues of the church, and nothing for covetousness, but any thing in obedience[d],' any thing, I mean, of the forenamed instances. Nay, the affairs of church revenues and dispensation of ecclesiastical patrimony was imposed on the bishop by the canons apostolical, and then considering how many possessions were deposited first at the apostles' feet, and afterwards in the bishop's hands[e], we may quickly perceive that a case may occur in which something else may be done by the bishop and his clergy besides prayer and preaching. Αἱ χῆραι μὴ ἀμελείσθωσαν, μετὰ τὸν Κύριον σὺ αὐτῶν φροντιστὴς ἔσο, saith Ignatius to S. Polycarp[f] of Smyrna, 'let not the widows be neglected; after God, do thou take care of them.' *Qui locupletes sunt et volunt, pro arbitrio quisque suo quod libitum est contribuit; et quod collectum est apud præsidem deponitur, atque is inde opitulatur orphanis, et viduis, iisque qui vel morbo vel alia de causa egent; tum iis qui vincti sunt, et peregre advenientibus hospitibus: et, ut uno*

[z] Can. xiv. [tom. ii. col. 774. 'Si quis clericus, . . t. l. g. a. n. exercuerit,' &c.]
[a] ['not,' C.]
[b] ['cura,' A.]
[c] Epist. lxvi. [al. i. p. 3.]
[d] Vide Synod. Roman. sub Sylvestr. can. iv. [tom. i. col. 291.]
[e] Concil. Chalced. can. xxvi. [tom. ii. col. 611.] et Zonar. ibid. [p. 117.]
[f] [§ 4. p. 40.]

verbo dicam, omnium indigentium curator est[g]; 'all the collects and offerings of faithful people are deposited with the bishop, and thence he dispenses for the relief of the widows and orphans, thence he provides for travellers, and in one word he takes care of all indigent and necessitous people.' So it was in Justin Martyr's time, and all this a man would think required a considerable portion of his time, besides his studies, and prayer, and preaching.

This was also done even in the apostles' times, for first they had the provision of all the goods, and persons of the *cœnobium*, of the church at Jerusalem. This they themselves administered, till a complaint arose which might have proved a scandal; then they chose seven men, men full of the Holy Ghost, men that were priests, for they were of the seventy disciples, saith Epiphanius[h]; and such men as preached and baptized, so S. Stephen and S. Philip; therefore to be sure they were clergymen, and yet they left their preaching for a time, at least abated of the height of the employment; for therefore the apostles appointed them, that themselves might not "leave the word of God and serve tables;" plainly implying that such men who were to serve these tables must leave the ministry of the word in some sense or degree; and yet they chose presbyters, and no harm neither, and for a while themselves had the employment. I say there was no harm done by this temporary office to their priestly function and employment: for to me it is considerable;—If the calling of a presbyter does not take up the whole man, then what inconvenience though his employment be mixed with secular allay? But if it does take up the whole man, then it is not safe for any presbyter ever to become a bishop, which is a dignity of a far greater burden, and requires more than a man's all, if all was required to the function of a presbyter. But I proceed.

4. The church prohibiting secular employment to bishops and clerks, do prohibit it only *in gradu impedimenti officii clericalis;* and therefore when the offices are supplied by any of the order, it is never prohibited but that the personal abilities of any man may be employed for the fairest advantages either of church or commonwealth. And therefore it is observable that the canons provide that the church be not destitute, not that such a particular clerk should there officiate. Thus the council of Arles[i] decreed, *Ut presbyteri, sicut hactenus factum est, indiscrete per diversa non mittantur loca; .. ne forte propter eorum absentiam et animarum pericula et ecclesiarum in quibus constituti sunt negligantur officia.* So that here we see, 1) That it had been usual to send priests on embassies, *sicut hactenus factum est.* 2) The canon forbids the indiscreet or promiscuous doing of it; not that men of great ability and choice be not employed, but that there be discretion or discerning in the

[g] Justin. Martyr., Apol. ii. [al. i. § 67. p. 83 E.]

[h] [vid. p. 26. not. r, supra.]

[i] [viz., Concil. Arelat. i. can. 21. tom. i. col. 266.] apud Burchard., lib. ii. decret., cap. 99. [p. 62. 8vo. Par. 1549.]

choice of the men, viz., that such men be chosen whose particular worth did by advancing the legation make compensation for absence from their churches; and then I am sure there was no indiscretion in the embassy, *quoad hoc* at least; for the ordinary offices of the church might be dispensed by men of even abilities, but the extraordinary affairs of both states require men of an heightened apprehension. 3) The canon only took care that 'the cure of the souls of a parish be not relinquished;' for so is the title of the canon, *Ne presbyteri causa legationis per diversa mittantur loca, cura animarum relicta;* but then if the cure be supplied by delegation, the fears of the canon are prevented.

In pursuance of this consideration, the church forbade clergymen to receive honour or secular preferment; and so it is expressed where the prohibition is made. It is in the council of Chalcedon[k]; *Qui semel in clero deputati sunt aut monachorum vitam expetiverunt statuimus neque ad militiam neque ad dignitatem aliquam venire mundanam;* that's the inhibition; but the canon subjoins a temper; *aut hoc tentantes et non agentes pœnitentiam, quo minus redeant ad hoc quod propter Deum primitus elegerunt, anathematizari;* 'they must not turn soldiers, or enter upon any worldly dignity to make them leave their function which for the honour of God they have first chosen.' For then it seems he that took on him military honours or secular prefectures or consular dignity, could not officiate in holy orders, but must renounce them to assume the other: it was in obstruction of this abuse that the canon directed its prohibition, viz., in this sense clearly, that a clerk must not so take on him secular offices, as to make him *redire in sæculum*, having put his hand to the plough, to look back, to change his profession, or to relinquish the church and make her become a widow. The case of S. Matthew and S. Peter distinguish and clear this business: *ecce reliquimus omnia*, was the profession of their clerical office: S. Matthew could not return to his trade of publican at all, for that would have taken him from his apostolate; But S. Peter might and did return to his nets, for all his *reliqui omnia;* plainly telling us that a secular calling, a continued fixed attendance on a business of the world, is an impediment to the clerical office and ministration, but not a temporary employment or secession.

5. The canons of the church do as much forbid the cares of household, as the cares of public employment, to bishops; so the fourth council of Carthage[l] decrees, *Ut episcopus nullam rei familiaris curam ad se revocet, sed lectioni et orationi et verbi Dei prædicationi tantummodo vacet.* Now if this canon be confronted with that saying of S. Paul[m], "he that provides not for them of his own household is worse than an infidel," it will easily inform us of the church's in-

[k] Part. ii. act. 15. can. 7. [tom. ii. col. 603.]

[l] Can. xx. [tom. i. col. 980.]

[m] [1 Tim. v. 8.]

tention: for they must provide, saith S. Paul, but yet so provide as not to hinder their employment, or else they transgress the canon of the council; but this *caveat* may be as well entered and observed in things political as economical.

Thus far we have seen what the church hath done in pursuance of her own interest; and that was, that she might with sanctity, and without distraction, tend her grand employment; but yet many cases did occur in which she did canonically permit an alienation of employment, and revocation of some persons from an assiduity of ecclesiastical attendance, as in the case of the seven set over the widows, and of S. Peter, and S. Paul, and all the apostles, and the canon of Chalcedon.

Now let us see how the Commonwealth also pursued her interest; and because she found bishops men of religion and great trust, and confident abilities, there was no reason that the commonwealth should be disserved in the promotion of able men to a bishop's throne. Who would have made recompense to the emperor for depriving him of Ambrose his prefect, if episcopal promotion had made him incapable of serving his prince in any great negotiation? It was a remarkable passage in Ignatius[n], *τὸν οὖν ἐπίσκοπον . . ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν, τῷ Κυρίῳ παρεστῶτα· ὁρατικὸν δὲ ἄνδρα καὶ ὀξὺν τοῖς ἔργοις βασιλεῦσι δεῖ παρεστάναι, καὶ μὴ παρεστάναι ἀνθρώποις νωθροῖς·* 'as our Lord is to be observed, so also must we observe the bishop, because he assists and serves the Lord; and wise men and of great understanding must serve kings, for he must not be served with men of small parts.' Here either Ignatius commends bishops to the service of kings, or else propounds them as the fittest men in the world to do them service: for if only men of great abilities are fit to serve kings, surely as great abilities are required to enable a man for the service of God in so peculiar manner of approximation; he then that is fit to be a bishop is most certainly fit for the service of his king. This is the sense of Ignatius his discourse.

For consider; christianity might be suspected for a design; and if the church should choose the best and most pregnant understandings for her employment, and then these men become incapable of aiding the republic, the promotion of these men would be an injury to those princes whose affairs would need support. The interest of the subjects also is considerable: for we find by experience that no authority is so full of regiment, and will so finely force obedience, as that which is seated in the conscience; and therefore Numa

[n] Epist. [interpol.] ad Ephes. [§ 6. p. 45.—But it escaped both Vedelius the translator, and Taylor (who quotes from him) that the latter portion of the passage is a quotation from Prov. xxii. 29, LXX. Vedelius' translation of it is, as it stands, unintelligible; Taylor's is erroneous. Our own version from the Hebrew is, "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings, he shall not stand before mean men."]

Pompilius made his laws, and imposed them, with a face of religious solemnity. For the people are stronger than any one governor, and were they not awed by religion would quickly *miscere sacra profanis*, 'jumble heaven and earth into a miscellany;' and therefore not only in the sanction of laws, but in the execution of them, the *antistites religionis* are the most competent instruments: and this was not only in all religions that ever were, and in ours ever till now, but even now we should quickly find it, were but our bishops in that veneration and esteem that by the law of God they ought, and that actually they were in the calenture of primitive devotion, and that the doctors of religion were ever even amongst the most barbarous and untaught pagans.

Upon the confidence of these advantages both the emperors themselves when they first became christian allowed appeals from secular tribunals to the bishop's consistory[o], even in causes of secular interest, and the people would choose to have their difficulties there ended whence they expected the issues of justice and religion; I say, this was done as soon as ever the emperors were christian. Before this time bishops and priests to be sure could not be employed in state affairs, they were odious for their christianity; and then no wonder if the church forbade secular employment in meaner offices, the attendance on which could by no means make recompense for the least avocation of them from their church employments: so that it was not only the avocation but the sordidness of the employment, that was prohibited the clergy in the constitutions of holy church. But as soon as ever their employment might be such as to make compensation for a temporary secession, neither church nor state did then prohibit it; and that was as soon as ever the princes were christian, for then immediately the bishops were employed in honorary negotiations. It was evident in the case of St. Ambrose; for the church of Milan had him for their bishop, and the emperor had him one of his prefects, and the people their judge in causes of secular cognizance. For when he was chosen bishop, the emperor, who was present at the election, cried out, *Gratias tibi ago Domine, quoniam huic viro ego quidem commisi corpora, tu autem animas, et meam electionem ostendisti tuæ justitiæ convenire*[p]. So that he was bishop and governor of Milan at the same time; and therefore by reason of both these offices, S. Austin[q] was forced to attend a good while before he could find him at leisure, *Non enim quærere ab eo poteram quod volebam sicut volebam, secludentibus me ab ejus aure atque ore catervis negotiosorum hominum quorum infirmitatibus serviebat.* And it was his own condition too when he came to sit in the chair of Hippo[r], *Non permittor ad quod volo vacare ante meridiem, et post meridiem occupationibus hominum teneor*[s]. And again[t], *Et homines*

[o] Sozom., lib. i. [cap. 9.]
[p] Cassiod. Hist. Tripart., lib. vii. cap. 8. [p. 305.]
[q] Confess., lib. vi. cap. 3. [tom. i. col. 121 A.]
[r] Ep. cx. [al. ccxiii. tom. ii. col. 790.]
[s] ['implicor,' edd.]
[t] Ep. cxlvii. [al. xxxiii. tom. ii. col. 63.]

quidam causas suas sæculares apud nos finire cupientes, quando eis necessarii fuerimus, sic nos sanctos et Dei servos appellant, ut negotia terræ suæ peragant: aliquando et agamus negotium salutis nostræ et salutis ipsorum, non de auro, non de argento, non de fundis et pecoribus, pro quibus rebus quotidie submisso capite salutamur, ut dissensiones hominum terminemus; it was almost the business of every day to him 'to judge causes concerning gold and silver, cattle and glebe,' and all appertenances[u] of this life. This S. Austin would not have done if it had not been lawful, so we are to suppose in charity; but yet this we are sure of, S. Austin thought it not only lawful but a part of his duty; *quibus nos molestiis idem affixit apostolus*[v]: and that by the authority not of himself but of Him that spake within him, even the H.[w] Ghost; so he.

Thus also it was usual for princes in the primitive church to send bishops their ambassadors: Constans[x] the emperor sent two bishops chosen out of the council of Sardis, together with Salianus the great master of his army, to Constantius; S. Chrysostom[y] was sent ambassador to Gainas; Maruthas[z] the bishop of Mesopotamia was sent ambassador from the emperor to Isdigerdes the king of Persia, S. Ambrose[a] from Valentinian the younger to the tyrant Maximus; Dorotheus[b] was a bishop and a chamberlain to the emperor. Many more examples there are of the concurrence of the episcopal office and a secular dignity or employment.

Now then consider. 1) The church did not, might not challenge any secular honour or employment by virtue of her ecclesiastical dignity precisely. 2) The church might not be ambitious or indagative of such employment. 3) The church's interest, abstractedly considered, was not promoted by such employment, but where there was no greater way of compensation, was interrupted and depressed. 4) The church, though in some cases she was allowed to make secession, yet might not relinquish her own charge to intervene in another's aid. 5) The church did by no means suffer her clerks to undertake any low secular employment, much more did she forbid all sordid ends and covetous designs. 6) The bishop or his clerks might ever do any action of piety, though of secular burden. Clerks were never forbidden to read grammar or philosophy to youth, to be masters of schools, of hospitals; they might reconcile their neighbours that were fallen out about a personal trespass or real action; and yet (since now-a-days a clergyman's employment and capacity is bounded within his pulpit or reading-desk, or his study of divinity at most) these that I have reckoned are as verily secular as any thing, and

[u] [sic A.]
[v] De opere monach., cap. xxix. [tom. vi. col. 499 D.]
[w] ['Holy,' C.]
[x] [Cassiod.] Hist. tripart., lib. iv. cap. 25. [p. 253.]
[y] Ibid., lib. x. cap. 6. [p. 356.]
[z] Ibid., lib. xi. cap. 8. [p. 368.]
[a] S. Ambros. ep., lib. v. c. 33. [Ben. ep. xxiv. tom. ii. col. 888.]
[b] Euseb. Hist. eccl., viii. 1. [p. 376.]

yet no law of christendom ever prohibited any of these, or any of the like nature, to the clergy; nor any thing that is ingenuous, that is fit for a scholar, that requires either fineness of parts, or great learning, or over-ruling authority, or exemplary piety. 7) Clergymen might do any thing that was imposed on them by their superiors. 8) The bishops and priests were men of great ability and surest confidence for determinations of justice, in which religion was ever the strongest binder. And therefore the princes and people sometimes forced the bishops from their own interest to serve the commonwealth, and in it they served themselves, directly, and by consequence too; the church had not only a sustentation from the secular arm, but an addition of honour and secular advantages; and all this warranted by precedent of scripture, and the practice of the primitive church, and particularly of men whom all succeeding ages have put into the calendar of saints. So that it would be considered, that all this while it is the king's interest and the people's that is pleaded, when we assert a capacity to the bishops to undertake charges of public trust. It is no addition to the calling of bishops: it serves the king, it assists the republic; and in such a plethory and almost a surfeit of clergymen as this age is supplied with, it can be no disservice to the church, whose daily offices may be plentifully supplied by vicars; and for the temporary avocation of some few, abundant recompense is made to the church, which is not at all injured by becoming an occasion of endearing the church to those whose aid she is.

There is an admirable epistle written by Petrus Blesensis[c], in the name of the archbishop of Canterbury, to P.[d] Alexander III., in the defence of the bishops of Ely, Winchester, and Norwich, that attended the court upon service of the king. *Non est novum,* saith he, *quod regum consiliis intersint episcopi, sicut enim honestate et sapientia cæteros antecedunt, sic expeditiores et efficaciores in reipublicæ administratione censentur; quia, sicut scriptum est, minus salubriter disponitur regnum quod non regitur consilio sapientum.— In quo notatur eos consiliis regum debere assistere qui sciant et velint et possint patientibus compati, paci terræ ac populi saluti prospicere, erudire ad justitiam reges, imminentibus occursare periculis, vitæque maturioris exemplis informare subditos et quadam auctoritate potestativa præsumptionem malignantium cohibere;* 'it is no new thing for bishops to be counsellors to princes,' saith he; 'their wisdom and piety, that enables them for a bishopric, proclaims them fit instruments to promote the public tranquillity of the commonwealth: they know how to comply with oppressed people, to advance designs of peace and public security; it is their office to instruct the king to righteousness, by their sanctity to be a rule to the court, and to diffuse their exemplary piety over the body of the kingdom, to mix

[c] Epist. lxxiv. [p. 127.] [d] ['Pope,' C.]

influences of religion with designs of state, to make them have as much of the dove as of the serpent, and by the advantage of their religious authority to restrain the malignity of accursed[e] people, in whom any image of a God or of religion is remaining.' He proceeds in the discourse, and brings the examples of Samuel, Isaiah, Elisha, Jehoiada, Zacharias, who were priests and prophets respectively, and yet employed in princes' courts and councils of kings; and adds this: *Unum noveritis, quia nisi familiares et consiliarii regis essent.. episcopi, supra dorsum ecclesiæ fabricarent hodie peccatores, et immaniter ac intolerabiliter opprimeret clerum præsumptio laicalis.* That's most true; if the church had not the advantage of additional honorary employments, 'the ploughers would plough upon the church's back, and make long furrows.' The whole epistle is worth transcribing, but I shall content myself with this summary of the advantages which are acquired both to policy and religion by the employment of bishops in princes' courts: *Istis mediantibus, mansuescit circa simplices judiciarius rigor, admittitur clamor pauperum, ecclesiarum dignitas erigitur, relevatur pauperum indigentia, firmatur in clero libertas, pax in populis, in monasteriis quies, justitia libere exercetur, superbia deprimitur, augetur laicorum devotio, religio fovetur, diriguntur judicia, &c.;* 'when pious bishops are employed in princes' councils, then the rigour of laws is abated, equity introduced, the cry of the poor is heard, their necessities are made known, the liberties of the church are conserved, the peace of kingdoms laboured for, pride is depressed, religion increaseth, the devotion of the laity multiplies, and tribunals are made just, and incorrupt, and merciful.' Thus far Petrus Blesensis. These are the effects which though perhaps they do not always fall out, yet these things may in expectation of reason be looked for from the clergy; their principles and calling promises all this. *Et quia in ecclesia magis lex est, ubi Dominus legis timetur, melius dicit apud Dei ministros agere causam; facilius enim de Dei timore sententiam legis veram promunt,* saith S. Ambrose[f]; and therefore certainly the fairest reason in the world that they be employed. But if personal defailance be thought reasonable to disemploy the whole calling, then neither clergy nor laity should ever serve a prince.

And now we are easily driven into an understanding of that saying of S. Paul[g], "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." For although this be spoken of all christian people, and concerns the laity in their proportion as much as the clergy, yet nor one nor the other is interdicted any thing that is not a direct hindrance to their own precise duty of christianity; and such things must be pared away from the fringes of the laity as well as the long robe of the clergy. But if we should consider how

[e] [i. e. 'ill-disposed, malignant;' see Johnson and Richardson on 'curst,' 'cursed,' and 'accursed.']

[f] In 1 Cor. vi. [ver. 1. tom. ii. append. col. 129 B.]

[g] [2 Tim. ii. 4.]

little we have now left for the employment of a bishop, I am afraid a bishop would scarce seem to be a necessary function, so far would it be from being hindered by the collateral intervening of a lay judicature. I need not instance in any particulars; for if the judging matters and questions of religion be not left alone to them, they may well be put into a temporal employment to preserve them from suspicion of doing nothing.

I have now done with this; only entreating this to be considered, Is not the king *fons utriusque jurisdictionis?* in all the senses of common law, and external compulsory, he is. But if so, then why may not the king as well make clergy judges, as lay delegates? For to be sure if there be an incapacity in the clergy of meddling with secular affairs, there is the same at least in the laity of meddling with church affairs: for if the clergy be above the affairs of the world, then the laity are under the affairs of the church; or else if the clergy be incapable of lay business because it is of a different and disparate nature from the church, does not the same argument exclude the laity from intervening in church affairs? for the church differs no more from the commonwealth than the commonwealth differs from the church. And now after all this, suppose a king should command a bishop to go on embassy to a foreign prince, to be a commissioner in a treaty of pacification, if the bishop refuse, did he do the duty of a subject? If yea, I wonder what subjection that is which a bishop owes to his prince, when he shall not be bound to obey him in any thing but the saying and doing of his office, to which he is obliged whether the prince commands him yea or no: but if no, then the bishop was tied to go, and then the calling makes him no way incapable of such employment, for no man can be bound to do a sin.

§ 50. And therefore were enforced to delegate their power, and put others in substitution.

But then did not this employment, when the occasions were great and extraordinary, force the bishops to a temporary absence? And what remedy was there for that? For the church is not to be left destitute, that's agreed on by all the canons; they must not be like the Sicilian bishops whom Petrus Blesensis complains of, that attended the court, and never visited their churches, or took care either of the cure of souls or of the church possessions. What then must be done? The bishops in such cases may give delegation of their power and offices to others, though now-a-days they are complained of for their care: I say, for their care; for if they may intervene in secular affairs, they may sometimes be absent, and then they must delegate their power, or leave the church without a curate. But for this matter the account need not be long. For since I have proved that the whole diocese is *in cura episcopali*, and for all of it he is responsive to God almighty, and yet that instant necessity and the public act of christendom hath ratified it, that bishops have delegated to presbyters so many parts of the bishop's charge as there are

parishes in his diocese, the *αὐθεντία* which is pretended for delegation of episcopal charge is no less than the act of all christendom. For it is evident at first presbyters had no distinct cure at all, but were in common assistant to the bishop, and were his emissaries for the gaining souls in city or suburbs: but when the bishops divided parishes and fixed the presbyters upon a cure, so many parishes as they distinguished so many delegations they made; and these we all believe to be good both in law and conscience: for the bishop *per omnes divinos ordines propriæ hierarchiæ exercet mysteria*, saith S. Denis[h]; he does not do the offices of his order by himself only, but by others also, for all the inferior orders do so operate as by them he does his proper offices.

But besides this grand act of the bishops first, and then of all christendom in consent, we have fair precedent in S. Paul; for he made delegation of a power to the church of Corinth to excommunicate the incestuous person. It was a plain delegation, for he commanded them to do it, and gave them 'his own spirit,' that is, his own authority; and indeed without it I scarce find how the delinquent should have been delivered over to Satan in the sense of the apostolic church; that is, 'to be buffeted,' for that was a miraculous appendix of power apostolic.

When S. Paul sent for Timothy from Ephesus, he sent Tychicus to be his vicar[i]. "Do thy diligence to come unto me shortly, for Demas hath forsaken me," &c., and "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." Here was an express delegation of the power of jurisdiction to Tychicus, who for the time was curate to S. Timothy. Epaphroditus for a while attended on S. Paul[j], although he was then bishop of Philippi; and either S. Paul or Epaphroditus appointed one in substitution, or the church was relinquished, for he was most certainly non-resident.

Thus also we find that S. Ignatius[k] did delegate his power to the presbyters, in his voyage to his martyrdom; *Presbyteri, pascite gregem qui inter vos est, donec Deus designaverit eum qui principatum in vobis habiturus est*, 'ye presbyters, do you feed the flock till God shall design you a bishop;' till then therefore it was but a delegate power; it could not else have expired in the presence of a superior. To this purpose is that of the Laodicean council[l], *Non oportet presbyteros ante ingressum episcopi ingredi et sedere in tribunalibus, .. nisi forte aut ægrotet episcopus, aut in peregrinis eum esse constiterit*; 'presbyters must not sit in consistory without the bishop, unless the bishop be sick or absent;' so that it seems what the bishop does when he is in his church, that may be committed to others in his absence. And to this purpose S. Cyprian[m] sent a plain commission

[h] Eccles. hierarch., cap. v. [p. 122 D.]
[i] [2 Tim. iv. 9, 12.]
[j] [Phil. ii. 25, 26.]
[k] Epist. [supposit.] ad Antioch. [§ 8. p. 106.]
[l] Can. lvi. [tom. i. col. 791.]
[m] Ep. vi. [al. xiv. p. 31.]

to his presbyters, *Fretus ergo et dilectione et religione vestra, . . his literis et hortor et mando ut vos . . vice mea fungamini circa gerenda ea quæ administratio religiosa deposcit,* 'I entreat and command you that you do my office in the administration of the affairs of the church.' And another time[n] he put Herculanus and Caldonius, two of his suffragans, together with Rogatianus and Numidicus, two priests, in substitution for the excommunicating Felicissimus and four more, *cum ego vos pro me vicarios miserim.* So it was just in the case of Hierocles bishop of Alexandria, and Melitius his surrogate, in Epiphanius[o]; *Videbatur autem et Melitius præminere, &c., ut qui secundum locum habebat post Petrum in archiepiscopatu, velut adjuvandi ejus gratia sub ipso existens, et sub ipso ecclesiastica curans;* 'he did church offices under and for Hierocles.' And I could never find any canon or personal declamatory clause in any council or primitive father, against a bishop's giving more or less of his jurisdiction by way of delegation.

Hitherto also may be referred that when the goods of all the church, which then were of a perplexed and busy dispensation, were all in the bishop's hand as part of the episcopal function, yet that part of the bishop's office the bishop, by order of the council of Chalcedon[p], might delegate to a steward, provided he were a clergyman. And upon this intimation and decree of Chalcedon the fathers in the council of Seville[q] forbade any laymen to be stewards for the church, *Elegimus ut unusquisque nostrum, secundum Chalcedonensium patrum decreta, ex proprio clero œconomum sibi constituat.* But the reason extends the canon further, *Indecorum est enim laicum vicarium esse episcopi, et sæculares in ecclesia judicare.* Vicars of bishops the canon allows, only forbids laymen to be vicars; *in uno enim eodemque officio non decet dispar professio, quod etiam in divina lege prohibetur, &c.;* 'in one and the same office the law of God forbids to join men of disparate capacities.' This then would be considered; for the canon pretends scripture, precepts of fathers, and tradition of antiquity, for its sanction.

§ 51. But they were ever clergymen, for there never was any lay elders in any church office heard of in the church.

For although antiquity approves of episcopal delegations of their power to their vicars, yet these vicars and delegates must be priests at least. Melitius was a bishop, and yet the chancellor of Hierocles patriarch of Alexandria; so were Herculanus and Caldonius to S. Cyprian: but they never delegated to any layman[r] any part of their episcopal power precisely. Of their lay power, or the cognizance of secular causes of the people, I find one delegation made to some gentlemen of the laity by Silvanus bishop

[n] Ep. xxxviii. et xxxix. [al. xli. sq. p. 79 sqq.]
[o] Hær. lxviii. [§ 1. p. 717 B.]
[p] [can. xxvi. tom. ii. col. 611.]
[q] Concil. Hispal. [ii. cap. 9. tom. iii. col. 560.]
[r] [See First and Second Admonitions to Parliament, A.D. 1571.]

of Troas[s]; when his clerks grew covetous, he cured their itch of gold by trusting men of another profession, so to shame them into justice and contempt of money. *Si quis autem episcopus posthac ecclesiasticam rem . . per laicalem procurationem administrandam elegerit, . . non solum a Christo de rebus pauperum judicabitur reus, sed etiam et concilio manebit obnoxius*[t], 'if any bishop shall hereafter concredit any church-affairs to lay administration, he shall be responsive to Christ, and in danger of the council.' But the thing was of more ancient constitution; for in that epistle which goes under the name of S. Clement[u], which is most certainly very ancient, whoever was the author of it, it is decreed, *Si qui ex fratribus negotia habent inter se, apud cognitores sæculi non judicentur, sed apud presbyteros ecclesiæ quicquid illud est dirimatur*, 'if christian people have causes of difference and judicial contestation, let it be ended before the priests:' for so S. Clement expounds *presbyteros* in the same epistle, reckoning it as a part of the sacred hierarchy. To this or some parallel constitution S. Hierome[x] relates, saying that "priests from the beginning were appointed judges of causes;" he expounds his meaning to be of such priests as were also bishops, and they were judges *ab initio*, 'from the beginning,' saith S. Hierome: so that the saying of the father may no way prejudge the bishop's authority, but it excludes the assistance of laymen from their consistories; *presbyter* and *episcopus* was instead of one word to S. Hierome, but they are always clergy with him and all men else.

But for the main question, S. Ambrose[y] did represent it to Valentinian the emperor with confidence and humility, *In causa fidei vel ecclesiastici alicujus ordinis, eum judicare debere qui nec munere impar sit, nec jure dissimilis.* The whole epistle is admirable to this purpose, *Sacerdotes de sacerdotibus judicare*, 'that clergymen must only judge of clergy causes;' and this S. Ambrose there calls *judicium episcopale*, 'the bishop's judicature.' *Si tractandum est, tractare in ecclesia didici, quod majores fecerunt mei; si conferendum de fide, sacerdotum debet esse ista collatio, sicut factum est sub Constantino aug. memoriæ principe:* so that both 'matters of faith' and 'of ecclesiastical order' are to be 'handled in the church,' and that 'by bishops,' and that *sub imperatore*, by permission and authority of the prince;' for so it was in Nice under Constantine: thus far S. Ambrose.—S. Athanasius[z] reports that Hosius bishop of Corduba, president in the Nicene council, said it was 'the abomination of desolation' that a layman shall be judge *in ecclesiasticis judiciis*, 'in church causes;' and Leontius[a] calls church affairs, *res alienas a laicis*,

[s] Socrat., lib. vii. [cap. 37.]
[t] Concil. Hispal. ubi supra. [can. ix. tom. iii. col. 560.]
[u] Epist. ad Jacob. fratr. Dom. [§ 10. Coteler., tom. i. p. 618.]
[x] De scpt. ord. eccles. [tom. v. col. 104 fin.]
[y] Epist. xiii. ad Valent. [Ben. xxi. §§ 2, 15. tom. ii. col. 860 C.]
[z] Epist. ad Solitar. [vid. p. 169. not. m, supr.]
[a] Suidas in Vita Leontii. [Tripol. episc. col. 2283 D.]

'things of another court, of a distinct cognizance from the laity.'—To these add the council of Venice[b], for it is very considerable in this question; *Clerico, nisi ex permissu episcopi sui, servorum suorum*[c] *sæcularia judicia adire non liceat: sed si fortasse episcopi sui judicium cæperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliqua adversus ipsum episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum episcoporum audientiam, non sæcularium potestatum debebit ambire; aliter a communione habeatur alienus;* 'clergymen without delegation from their bishop may not hear the causes of their servants, but the bishop; unless the bishop be appealed from, then other bishops must hear the cause, but no lay judges by any means.'—These sanctions of holy church it pleased the emperor to ratify by an imperial edict, for so Justinian commanded, that in causes ecclesiastical secular judges should have no interest; *Sed sanctissimus episcopus secundum sacras regulas causæ finem imponat*[d], 'the bishop according to the sacred canons must be the sole judge of church matters.'—I end this with the decretal of S. Gregory[e], one of the four doctors of the church, *Cavendum a fraternitate vestra est ne sæcularibus viris atque non sub regula nostra degentibus res ecclesiasticæ committantur,* 'heed must be taken that matters ecclesiastical be not any ways concredited to secular persons.' But of this I have twice spoken already, § 36 and § 41.

The thing is so evident that it is next to impudence to say that in antiquity laymen were parties and assessors in the consistory of the church. It was against their faith, it was against their practice; and those few pigmy objections out of Tertullian[f], S. Ambrose[g], and S. Austin[h], using the word *seniores* or 'elders,' sometimes for priests, as being the Latin for the Greek πρεσβύτεροι, sometimes for a secular magistrate or alderman (for I think S. Austin did so in his third book against Cresconius) are but like sophoms to prove that two and two are not four; for to pretend such slight, airy imaginations, against the constant, known, open catholic practice and doctrine of the church and history of all ages, is as if a man should go to fight an imperial army with a single bulrush. They are not worth further considering.

But this is; that in this question of lay elders the modern Aërians and Acephali do wholly mistake their own advantages; for whatsoever they object out of antiquity for the white and watery colours of lay-elders, is either a very misprision of their allegations, or else clearly abused in the use of them. For now-a-days they are only

[b] A.D. 453, can. ix. [tom. ii. col. 797 E.]

[c] [sic ed. Bin. "Clericis nisi ex permissu episcoporum suorum sæcularia," &c.—Harduin, Mansi.]

[d] Novell. const. cxxiii. [cap. 21. tom. iii. col. 259.]

[e] Lib. vii. epist. 66. [leg. 67. al. lib. ix. ep. 65. tom. ii. col. 982.]

[f] Tertul. Apol., cap. xxxiii. [p. 28.]

[g] In 1 Tim. v. 1. [tom. ii. append. col. 298 E.] et De off. min., lib. i. cap. 20. [tom. ii. col. 25 A.]

[h] Contr. Crescon., lib. iii. [cap. lvi. tom. ix. col. 466 D.] et ep. cxxxvii. [Ben. lxxviii. tom. ii. col. 182.]

used to exclude and drive forth episcopacy; but then they misallege antiquity; for the men with whose heifers they would fain plough in this question were themselves bishops for the most part, and he that was not, would fain have been; it is known so of Tertullian; and therefore most certainly, if they had spoken of lay-judges in church matters (which they never dreamed of) yet meant them not so as to exclude episcopacy, and if not, then the pretended allegations can do no service in the present question.

I am only to clear this pretence from a place of scripture totally misunderstood, and then it cannot have any colour from any *ἀνθεντία* either divine or human, but that lay-judges of causes ecclesiastical, as they are unheard of in antiquity, so they are neither named in scripture, nor receive from thence any instructions for their deportment in their imaginary office; and therefore may be remanded to the place from whence they came, even the lake of Gehenna, and so to the place of the nearest denomination. The objection is from S. Paul[i], *οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, κ. τ. λ.* 'let the elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honour, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine;' 'especially they,' therefore all elders do not so: here are two sorts of elders, preaching ministers, and elders not preachers, therefore lay-elders; and yet all are governors.

1. But why therefore lay-elders? why may there not be divers church-officers, and yet but one or two of them the preacher? "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach," saith S. Paul[k], and yet the commission of *Baptizate* was as large as *Prædicate;* and why then might not another say, 'Christ sent me not to preach, but to baptize?' that is, in S. Paul's sense, not so much to do one as to do the other; and if he left the ordinary ministration of baptism and betook himself to the ordinary office of preaching, then to be sure some minister must be the ordinary baptizer, and so not the preacher: for if he might be both ordinarily, why was not S. Paul both? For though their power was common to all of the same order, yet the execution and dispensation of the ministries was according to several gifts, and that of prophecy or preaching was not dispensed to all in so considerable a measure but that some of them might be destined to the ordinary execution of other offices, and yet because the gift of prophecy was the greatest, so also was the office; and therefore the sense of the words is this, that 'all presbyters must be honoured, but especially they that prophesy, doing that office with an ordinary execution and ministry:' so no lay-elders yet.—Add to this, that it is also plain that all the clergy did not preach. Valerius bishop of Hippo could not well skill of the Latin tongue, being a Greek born, and yet a godly bishop; and S. Austin his presbyter preached for him. The same case might occur in the apostles' times, for then was a concourse of all nations to the christian *synaxes,*

[i] [1 Tim. v. 17.] [k] [1 Cor. i. 17.]

especially in all great imperial cities and metropolitans, as Rome, Antioch, Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and the like: now all could not speak with tongues, neither could all prophesy; they were particular gifts, given severally to several men appointed to minister in church offices: some prophesied, some interpreted; and therefore it is an ignorant fancy to think that he must needs be a laic whosoever in the ages apostolical was not a preacher.

2. None of the fathers ever expounded this place of lay-elders, so that we have a traditive interpretation of it in prejudice to the pretence of our new office.

3. The word presbyter is never used in the New testament for a layman, if a church officer be intended: if it be said it is used so here, that is the question, and must not be brought to prove itself.

4. The presbyter that is here spoken of must be maintained by ecclesiastical revenue, for so S. Paul expounds 'honour' in the next verse, "presbyters that rule well must be honoured," &c., "for it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." But now the patrons of this new device are not so greedy of their lay-bishops as to be at charges with them, they will rather let them stand alone on their own rotten legs and so perish, than fix him upon this place with their hands in their purses. But it had been most fitting for them to have kept him, being he is of their own begetting.

5. This place speaks not of divers persons, but divers parts of the pastoral office, προϊστασθαι, and κοπιᾷν ἐν λόγῳ, 'to rule' and 'to labour in the word.' Just as if the expression had been *in materia politica*, 'all good counsellors of state are worthy of double honour, especially them that, disregarding their own private, aim at the public good:' this implies not two sorts of counsellors, but two parts of a counsellor's worth and quality; judges that do righteousness are worthy of double honour, especially if they right the cause of orphans and widows, and yet there are no righteous judges that refuse to do both.

6. All ministers of holy church did not preach, at least not frequently. The seven that were ἐπὶ τῶν χήρων τεταγμένοι, 'set over the widows,' were presbyters, but yet they were forced to leave the constant ministration of the word to attend that employment, as I shewed formerly[1]; and thus it was in descent too, for ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ οὐ προσομιλεῖ, said Socrates[m], 'a presbyter does not preach in Alexandria,' the bishop only did it. And then the allegation is easily understood, for 'labouring in the word' does not signify only making homilies or exhortations to the people, but whether it be by word, or writing, or travelling from place to place, still the greater the sedulity of the person is and difficulty of the labour, the greater increment of honour is to be given him. So that here is no lay-elders; for all the presbyters S. Paul speaks of are to be

[1] Sect. 48.

[m] Lib. v. [cap. 22.]

honoured, but especially those who take extraordinary pains in propagating the gospel: for though all preach (suppose that) yet all do not κοπιᾷν, take such great pains in it as is intimated in κοπιῶντες· for κοπιᾷν is 'to take bodily labour and travail[n]' *usque ad lassitudinem,* so Budæus renders it: and so it is likely S. Paul here means, 'honour the good presbyters, but especially them that travel for disseminating the gospel.' And the word is often so used in scripture; S. Paul, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον πάντων ἐκοπίασα, 'I have travelled in the word more than they all;' not that S. Paul preached more than all the apostles, for most certainly they made it their business as well as he, but he travelled further and more than they all for the spreading it. And thus it is said[o] of the good women that travelled with the apostles for supply of the necessities of their diet and household offices, they "laboured much in the Lord;" κοπιᾷν is the word for them too: so it is said of Persis, of Mary, of Tryphena, of Tryphosa; and since those women were κοπιῶσαι ἐν Κυρίῳ that travelled with the apostolical men and evangelists, the men also travelled too and preached, and therefore were κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ, that is, 'travellers in the word:' "we ought therefore to receive such," saith S. John[p], intimating a particular reception of them as being towards us of a peculiar merit. So that the sense of S. Paul may be this also, 'all the rulers of the church, that is, all bishops, apostles, and apostolic men, are to be honoured, but especially them who, besides the former ruling, are also travellers in the word, or evangelists.'

7. We are furnished with answer enough to infatuate this pretence for lay-elders from the common draught of the new discipline; for they have some that preach only, and some that rule and preach too, and yet neither of them the lay-elders, viz., their pastors and doctors.

8. Since it is pretended by themselves in the question of episcopacy that *presbyter* and *episcopus* is all one, and this very thing confidently obtruded in defiance of episcopacy, why may not *presbyteri* in this place signify 'bishops?' and then either this must be lay-bishops as well as lay-presbyters, or else this place is to none of their purposes.

9. If both these offices of ruling and preaching may be conjunct in one person, then there is no necessity of distinguishing the officers by the several employments, since one man may do both: but if these offices cannot be conjunct, then no bishops must preach, nor no preachers be of the consistory, take which government you list; for if they be, then the offices being united in one person, the inference of the distinct officer, the lay-elder, is impertinent; for the meaning of S. Paul would be nothing but this, 'All church rulers must be honoured, especially for their preaching;' for if the offices may be united in one person (as it is evident they may) then this may be comprehended within the other, and only be a vital part and of peculiar excellency. And indeed so it is, according to the exposition of

[n] ['travel,' C.] [o] [Rom. xvi.] [p] [3 John 8.]

S. Chrysostom[q] and Primasius[r]: τοῦτό ἐστι καλῶς προεστάναι, μηδενὸς φείδεσθαι τῆς τῶν προβάτων[s] κηδεμονίας ἕνεκεν, 'they rule well that spare nothing for the care of the flock;' so that this is the general charge, and preaching is the particular. For the work in general they are to receive double honour, but this of preaching, as then preaching was, had a particular excellency, and a plastic power to form men into christianity, especially it being then attested with miracles.

But the new office of a LAY-ELDER I confess I cannot comprehend in any reasonable proportion; his person, his quality, his office, his authority, his subordination, his commission hath made so many divisions and new emergent questions, and they none of them all asserted either by scripture or antiquity, that if I had a mind to leave the way of God and of the catholic church and run in pursuit of this meteor, I might quickly be amused, but should find nothing certain but a certainty of being misguided: therefore if not for conscience' sake, yet for prudence, *bonum est esse hic*, it is good to remain in the fold of Christ, under the guard and supravision of those shepherds Christ hath appointed, and which His sheep have always followed.

For I consider this one thing to be enough to determine the question. "My sheep," saith our blessed Saviour, "hear My voice; if a stranger or a thief come, him they will not hear." Clearly thus; that Christ's sheep hear not the voice of a stranger, nor will they follow him, and therefore those shepherds whom the church hath followed in all ages are no strangers but shepherds or pastors of Christ's appointing; or else Christ hath had no sheep, for if He hath, then bishops are the shepherds, for them they have ever followed.—I end with that golden rule of Vincentius Lirinensis[t], *Magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est; hoc est enim vere proprieque catholicum.* For certainly the catholic belief of the church against Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, and the worst of heretics the Cataphrygians, was never more truly received 'of all and always and everywhere,' than is the government of the church by bishops. *Adnunciare ergo.. christianis catholicis præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit,* 'it never was, is, nor ever shall be lawful to teach christian people any new thing than what they have received' from a primitive fountain, and is descended in the stream of catholic uninterrupted succession.

I only add, that the church hath insinuated it to be the duty of all good catholic christians to pray for bishops, and as the case now stands, for episcopacy itself: for there was never any church liturgy but said litanies for their KING, and for their BISHOP.

ΑΓΙΟΣ Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ.

[q] [In 1 Tim. v. 17. hom. xv. tom. xi. p. 636 D.]

[r] [In eund. loc., p. 174 a.]

[s] [τῆς ἐκείνων, edd.]

[t] Adv. hær. [cap. ii, ix. pp. 103, 6.]

AN

APOLOGY

FOR

AUTHORIZED AND SET FORMS

OF

LITURGY,

AGAINST

THE PRETENCE OF THE SPIRIT,

FOR

1. *EX TEMPORE* PRAYER,

AND

2. FORMS OF PRIVATE COMPOSITION.

The compilers of the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England (as it now is) were

Doctor
- CRANMER, Archbishop of Canterbury.
- GOODRICK, Bishop of Ely.
- SKIP, Bishop of Hereford.
- THIRLBY, Bishop of Westminster.
- DAY, Bishop of Chichester.
- HOLBECK, Bishop of Lincoln.

Doctor
- RIDLEY, Bishop of Rochester.
- TAYLOR, Dean of Lincoln.
- HEYNES, Dean of Exeter.
- REDMAN, Dean of Westminster.
- COX, King Edward's Almoner.
- MR. ROBINSON, Archdeacon of Leicester.

Mense Maio 1549. *Anno Regni* Edwardi *Sexti tertio.*

TO HIS

MOST SACRED MAJESTY.

It is now two years since part of these ensuing papers[a], like the public issue of the people, imperfect and undressed, were exposed without a parent to protect them or any hand to nourish them. But since your most sacred majesty was pleased graciously to look upon them, they are grown into a tract, and have an ambition (like the gourd of Jonas) to dwell in the eye of the sun from whence they received life and increment. And although because some violence hath been done to the profession of the doctrine of this treatise, it may seem to be *verbum in tempore non suo*, and like the offering cypress to a conqueror or palms to a broken army; yet I hope I shall the less need an apology, because it is certain he does really disserve no just and noble interest, that serves that of the Spirit, and religion. And because the sufferings of a king and a confessor are the great demonstration to all the world that truth is as dear to your majesty as the jewels of your diadem, and that your conscience is tender as a pricked eye; I shall pretend this only to alleviate the inconvenience of an unseasonable address, that I present your majesty with a humble persecuted truth, of the same constitution with that condition whereby you are become most dear to God, as having upon you the characterism of the sons of God, bearing in your sacred person the marks of the Lord Jesus, who is your elder

[a] [Under the title of 'A Discourse concerning prayer *ex tempore*, or by pretence of the Spirit, in justification of authorized and set forms of Liturgy,' 1646.]

brother, the King of sufferings, and the Prince of the catholic church. But I consider that kings, and their great councils, and rulers ecclesiastical, have a special obligation for the defence of liturgies, because they having the greatest offices have the greatest needs of auxiliaries from heaven, which are best procured by the public spirit, the spirit of government and supplication. And since the first, the best, and most solemn liturgies and set forms of prayer were made by the best and greatest princes, by Moses, by David, and the son of David; your majesty may be pleased to observe such a proportion of circumstances in my laying this 'Apology for Liturgy' at your feet, that possibly I may the easier obtain a pardon for my great boldness; which if I shall hope for, in all other contingencies I shall represent myself a person indifferent whether I live or die, so I may by either serve God, and God's church, and God's vicegerent, in the capacity of,

Great Sir,

your majesty's most humble

and most obedient subject and servant,

JER. TAYLOR.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE[a]

TO

THE APOLOGY

FOR

AUTHORIZED AND SET FORMS OF LITURGY.

WHEN judges were instead of kings, and Hophni and Phinehas were among the priests, every man did what was right in his own eyes, but few did what was pleasing in the eyes of the Lord; and the event was this, God put on His fierce anger against them, and stirred up and armed the enemies of their country and religion, and they prevailed very far, against the expectation and confidence of them who thought the goodness of their cause would have borne out the iniquity of their persons, and that the impiety of their adversaries would have disabled them even from being made God's scourges and instruments of punishing His own people: the sadness of the event proved the vanity of their hopes; for that which was the instrument of their worship, the determination of their religious addresses, the place where God did meet His people, from which the priests spake to God and God gave His oracles, that they dishonourably and miserably lost: the ark of the Lord was taken, the impious priests who made the sacrifice of the Lord to become an abomination to the people, were slain with the sword of the Philistines; old Eli lost his life, and the wife of Phinehas died with sorrow and the miscarriages of child-birth, crying out that 'the glory was departed from Israel, because the ark of God was taken.'

2. In these things we also have been but too like the sons of Israel; for when we sinned as greatly, we also have groaned under as great and sad a calamity. For we have not only felt the evils of an intestine war, but God hath smitten us in our spirit, and

[a] [Published first with the third edition, viz., that in the Σύμβολον θεολογικὸν, 1673. It must have been written between 1657 (the date of the second edition) and the Restoration in 1660; see § 3.]

laid the scene of His judgments especially in religion; He hath snuffed our lamp so near that it is almost extinguished, and the sacred fire was put into a hole of the earth, even then when we were forced to light those tapers that stood upon our altars, that by this sad truth better than by the old ceremony we might prove our succession to those holy men who were constrained to sing hymns to Christ in dark places and retirements.

3. But I delight not to observe the correspondencies of such sad accidents, which as they may happen upon divers causes, or may be forced violently by the strength of fancy, or driven on by jealousy and the too fond openings of troubled hearts and afflicted spirits; so they do but help to vex the offending part, and relieve the afflicted but with a fantastic and groundless comfort: I will therefore deny leave to my own affections to ease themselves by complaining of others; I shall only crave leave that I may remember Jerusalem, and call to mind the pleasures of the temple, the order of her services, the beauty of her buildings, the sweetness of her songs, the decency of her ministrations, the assiduity and economy of her priests and Levites, the daily sacrifice, and that eternal fire of devotion that went not out by day nor by night; these were the pleasures of our peace, and there is a remanent felicity in the very memory of those spiritual delights which we then enjoyed, as antepasts of heaven and consignations to an immortality of joys. And it may be so again, when it shall please God who hath the hearts of all princes in His hand, and turneth them as the rivers of waters; and when men will consider the invaluable loss that is consequent, and the danger of sin that is appendent, to the destroying such forms of discipline and devotion in which God was purely worshipped and the church was edified, and the people instructed to great degrees of piety, knowledge, and devotion.

4. And such is the liturgy of the church of England. I shall not need to enumerate the advantages of liturgy in general, though it be certain that some liturgy or other is most necessary in public addresses, 1) that so we may imitate the perpetual practice of all settled churches since christianity, or ever since Moses' law or the Jewish church came to have a settled foot, and any rest in the land of Canaan; 2) that we may follow the example and obey the precept of our blessed Saviour, who appointed a set form of devotion; and certainly they that profess enmity against all liturgy can in no sense obey the precept given by Him who gave command, "When ye pray, say, Our Father;" 3) that all that come may know the condition of public communion, their religion, and manner of address to God almighty; 4) that the truth of the proposition, the piety of the desires and the honesty of the petitions, the simplicity of our purposes and the justice of our designs, may be secured beforehand; because 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin,' and it is impossible that we should pray to God in the *ex tempore* prayers of the priest by any faith but

unreasonable, unwarranted, insecure, and implicit; 5) that there may be union of hearts, and spirits, and tongues; 6) that there may be a public symbol of communion in our prayers, which are the best instruments of endearing us to God and to one another; καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ προσευχὴ μὴ ἔχουσα τοὺς συμφωνοῦντας ἀνενδεεστέρα[b] ἐστὶ πολλῷ ἑαυτῆς, 'private prayer, not assisted with the concord and unity of a public spirit, is weaker and less effectual,' saith S. Basil; 7) that the ministers less learned may have provisions of devotions made for them; 8) that the more learned may have no occasion of ostentation ministered to them, lest their best actions, their prayers, be turned into sin; 9) that extravagant levities, and secret impieties, be prevented; 10) that the offices ecclesiastical may the better secure the articles of religion; 11) that they may edify the people, by being repositories of holy and necessary truths ready formed out of their needs, and described in their books of daily use; for that was one of the advices of the apostle[c], "teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs;" 12) that men by the intervening of authority may be engaged to certain devotions; 13) that not only the duty, but the very form of its ministration may be honoured by the countenance of authority, and not be exposed to contempt by reason of the insufficiency of its external warrant; 14) that the assignation of such offices, and appropriating them to the ministry of certain persons, may be a cancel to secure the enclosures of the clerical orders from the usurpings and invasions of pretending and unhallowed spirits; 15) that indetermination of the office may not introduce indifferency, nor indifferency lead in a freer liberty, or liberty degenerate into licentiousness, or licentiousness into folly and vanity; and these come sometimes attended with secular designs, lest these be cursed with the immission of a peevish spirit upon our priests, and that spirit be a teacher of lies, and these lies become the basis of impious theorems, which are certainly attended with ungodly lives; and then either atheism or antichristianism may come, according as shall happen in the conjunction of time and other circumstances; for this would be a sad climax, a ladder upon which are no angels ascending or descending, because the degrees lead to darkness and misery.

5. But that which is of special concernment is this, that the liturgy of the church of England hath advantages so many and so considerable, as not only to raise itself above the devotions of other churches, but to endear the affections of good people to be in love with liturgy in general.

6. For to the churches of the Roman communion we can say that ours is reformed, to the reformed churches we can say that ours is orderly and decent; for we were freed from the impositions and lasting errors of a tyrannical spirit, and yet from the extravagancies of a

[b] [leg. ἀθρανεστέρα.—ep. xcvii. tom. iii. p. 191 B.] [c] [Colos. iii. 16.]

popular spirit too; our reformation was done without tumult, and yet we saw it necessary to reform; we were zealous to cast away the old errors, but our zeal was balanced with consideration and the results of authority: not like women or children when they are affrighted with fire in their clothes; we shaked off the coal indeed, but not our garments, lest we should have exposed our churches to that nakedness, which the excellent men of our sister churches complained to be among themselves.

7. And indeed it is no small advantage to our liturgy, that it was the offspring of all that authority which was to prescribe in matters of religion. The king and the priest, which are the *antistites religionis* and the preservers of both the tables, joined in this work, and the people, as it was represented in parliament, were advised withal, in authorizing the form after much deliberation; for the rule, *Quod spectat ad omnes ab omnibus tractari debet,* was here observed with strictness, and then as it had the advantages of discourse, so also of authorities, its reason from one and its sanction from the other, that it might be both reasonable, and sacred, and free not only from the indiscretions but (which is very considerable) from the scandal of popularity.

8. And in this I cannot but observe the great wisdom and mercy of God in directing the contrivers of the liturgy with the spirit of zeal and prudence to allay the furies and heats of the first affrightment. For when men are in danger of burning, so they leap from the flames they consider not whither, but whence; and the first reflexions of a crooked tree are not to straightness, but to a contrary incurvation: yet it pleased the Spirit of God so to temper and direct their spirits, that in the first liturgy of king Edward they did rather retain something that needed further consideration than reject any thing that was certainly pious and holy; and in the second liturgy, that they might also throughly reform, they did rather cast out something that might with good profit have remained, than not satisfy the world of their zeal to reform, of their charity in declining every thing that was offensive, and the clearness of their light in discerning every semblance of error or suspicion in the Roman church.

9. The truth is, although they framed the liturgy with the greatest consideration that could be by all the united wisdom of this church and state, yet as if prophetically to avoid their being charged in after ages with a *crepusculum* of religion, a dark, twilight, imperfect reformation, they joined to their own star all the shining tapers of the other reformed churches, calling for the advice of the most eminently learned and zealous reformers in other kingdoms, that the light of all together might shew them a clear path to walk in. And this their care produced some change; for upon the consultation the first form of king Edward's service book was approved with the exception of a very few clauses, which upon that occasion were reviewed and expunged, till it came to that second form and modest beauty it was in

the edition of MDLII., and which Gilbertus a German approved of as a transcript of the ancient and primitive forms.

10. It was necessary for them to stay somewhere. Christendom was not only reformed, but divided too, and every division would to all ages have called for some alteration, or else have disliked it publicly; and since all that cast off the Roman yoke thought they had title enough to be called reformed, it was hard to have pleased all the private interests and peevishness of men that called themselves friends: and therefore that only in which the church of Rome had prevaricated against the word of God, or innovated against apostolical tradition, all that was pared away: but at last she fixed, and strove no further to please the people, who never could be satisfied.

11. The painter that exposed his work to the censure of the common passengers, resolving to mend it as long as any man could find fault, at last had brought the eyes to the ears and the ears to the neck, and for his excuse subscribed, *Hanc populus fecit;* but his *hanc ego,* that which he made by the rules of his art and the advice of men skilled in the same mystery, was the better piece. The church of England should have pared away all the canon of the communion if she had mended her piece at the prescription of the Zuinglians, and all her office of baptism if she had mended by the rules of the Anabaptists, and kept up altars still by the example of the Lutherans, and not have retained decency by the good will of the Calvinists; and now another new light is sprung up, she should have no liturgy at all, but the worship of God be left to the managing of chance, and indeliberation, and a petulant fancy.

12. It began early to discover its inconvenience; for when certain zealous persons fled to Frankfort to avoid the funeral piles kindled by the Roman bishops in queen Mary's time, as if they had not enemies enough abroad they fell foul with one another, and the quarrel was about the common-prayer-book; and some of them made their appeal to the judgment of Mr. Calvin, whom they prepossessed with strange representments and troubled phantasms concerning it; and yet the worst he said upon the provocation of those prejudices was that even its vanities were tolerable; *tolerabiles ineptias* was the unhandsome epithet he gave to some things which he was forced to dislike by his over earnest complying with the brethren of Frankfort.

13. Well, upon this the wisdom of this church and state saw it necessary to fix where with advice she had begun, and with counsel she had once mended. And to have altered in things inconsiderable upon a new design or sullen mistake, had been extreme levity, and apt to have made the men contemptible, their authority slighted, and the thing ridiculous, especially before adversaries that watched all opportunity and appearances to have disgraced the reformation. Here therefore it became a law, was established by an act of parliament, was made solemn by an appendent penalty against all that on either

hand did prevaricate a sanction of so long and so prudent consideration.

14. But the common-prayer-book had the fate of S. Paul; for when it had scaped the storms of the Roman sea, yet a viper sprung out of queen Mary's fires, which at Frankfort first leaped upon the hand of the church, but since that time it hath gnawn the bowels of its own mother, and given itself life by the death of its parent and nurse.

15. For as for the adversaries from the Roman party, they were so convinced by the piety and innocence of the common-prayer-book that they could accuse it of no deformity, but of imperfection; of a want of some things which they judged convenient because the error had a wrinkle on it and the face of antiquity. And therefore for ten or eleven years they came to our churches, joined in our devotions and communicated without scruple, till a temporal interest of the church of Rome rent the schism wider, and made it gape like the jaws of the grave.

And let me say, it adds no small degree to my confidence and opinion of the English common-prayer-book, that amongst the numerous armies sent from the Roman seminaries (who were curious enough to enquire, able enough to find out, and wanted no anger to have made them charge home any error in our liturgy, if the matter had not been unblamable and the composition excellent) there was never any impiety or heresy charged upon the liturgy of the church: for I reckon not the calumnies of Harding[d], for they were only in general, calling it 'darkness,' &c., from which aspersion it was worthily vindicated by M. Deering. The truth of it is, the compilers took that course which was sufficient to have secured it against the malice of a Spanish inquisitor, or the scrutiny of a more inquisitive presbytery; for they put nothing of controversy into their prayers, nothing that was then matter of question; only because they could not prophesy, they put in some things which since then have been called to question by persons whose interest was highly concerned to find fault with something: but that also hath been the fate of the penmen of holy scripture, some of which could prophesy, and yet could not prevent this. But I do not remember that any man was ever put to it to justify the common prayer against any positive, public, and professed charge by a Roman adversary: nay, it is transmitted to us by the testimony of persons greater than all exceptions[e], that Paulus Quartus in his private intercourses and letters to queen Elizabeth did offer to confirm the English common-prayer-book, if she would acknowledge his primacy and authority, and the reformation derivative from him. And his lenity was pursued by his

[d] [For an account of this controversy, Harding's attack upon Jewel, and the reply by Dering (Deering or Debring) see Strype, Annals, chapp. xvi. xxv. lii.]

[e] [Bp. Andrewes,] Tortura Torti, p. 142. [4to. Lond. 1609.]

successor Pius Quartus[f], with an *Omnia de nobis tibi polliceare;* he assured her she should have any thing from him, not only things pertaining to her soul, but what might conduce to the establishment and confirmation of her royal dignity; amongst which that the liturgy new established by her authority should not be rescinded by the pope's power, was not the least considerable.

16. And possibly this hath cast a cloud upon it in the eyes of such persons who never will keep charity, or so much as civility, but with those with whom they have made a league offensive and defensive against all the world. This hath made it to be suspected of too much compliance with that church and her offices of devotion, and that it is a very *cento* composed out of the Mass-book, Pontifical, Breviaries, Manuals, and Portuises of the Roman church.

17. I cannot say but many of our prayers are also in the Roman offices. But so they are also in the scripture, so also is the Lord's prayer; and if they were not, yet the allegation is very inartificial, and the charge peevish and unreasonable, unless there were nothing good in the Roman books, or that it were unlawful to pray a good prayer which they had once stained with red letters. The objection hath not sense enough to procure an answer upon its own stock, but by reflection from a direct truth, which uses to be like light, manifesting itself and discovering darkness.

18. It was first perfected in king Edward VI.'s time, but it was by and by impugned, 'through the obstinate and dissembling malice of many;' they are the words of M. Fox, in his book of martyrs. Then it was reviewed and published with so much approbation that it was accounted the work of God; but yet not long after there were some persons *qui divisionis occasionem arripiebant,* saith Alesius[g], *vocabula et pene syllabas expendendo,* 'they tried it by points and syllables, and weighed every word,' and sought occasions to quarrel: which being observed by archbishop Cranmer, he caused it to be translated into Latin, and sent it to Bucer, requiring his judgment of it, who returned this answer, that "although there are in it some things *quæ rapi possunt ab inquietis ad materiam contentionis,* which by peevish men may be cavilled at, yet there was nothing in it but what was taken out of the scriptures, or agreeable to it if rightly understood, that is, if handled and read by wise and good men." The zeal which archbishop Grindal, bishop Ridley, Dr. Taylor, and other the holy martyrs and confessors in queen Mary's time, expressed for this excellent liturgy before and at the time of their death, defending it by their disputations, adorning it by their practice, and sealing it with their bloods, are arguments which ought to recommend it to all the sons of the church of England for ever, infinitely to be valued beyond all the little whispers and murmurs of argument pretended against it: and when it came out

[f] Camd. Annal. A.D. 1560. [tom. i. p. 72. ed. Hearn. 8vo. 1717.]

[g] ['Ordinatio ecclesiæ,' &c. in procem. Lips. 4to. 1551.]

of the flame and was purified in the martyrs' fires, it became a vessel of honour, and used in the house of God in all the days of that long peace which was the effect of God's blessing, and the reward as we humbly hope of a holy religion and when it was laid aside in the days of queen Mary, it was 'to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion;' they are the words of queen Elizabeth and her grave and wise parliament.

19. Archbishop Cranmer[h] in his purgation, A.D. 1553, made an offer if the queen would give him leave, to prove all that is contained in the common-prayer-book to be conformable to that order which our blessed Saviour Christ did both observe and command to be observed; and a little after he offers to join issue upon this point, that the order of the church of England set out by authority of the innocent and godly prince Edward VI. in his high court of parliament is the same that was used in the church fifteen hundred years past.

---

20. And I shall go near to make his words good[i]; for,

Very much of our liturgy is the very words of scripture. The psalms and lessons, and all the hymns save one, are nothing else but scripture, and owe nothing to the Roman breviaries for their production or authority; so that the matter of them is out of question holy and true: as for the form, none ever misliked it but they that will admit no form, for all admit this that admit any. But that these should be parts of liturgy needs not to be a question, when we remember, that Hezekiah and the princes made it a law to their church to sing praises to the Lord "with the words of David and of Asaph the seer[j];" and that Christ himself did so and His apostles after the manner of the Jews in the feast of passover, sung their hymns and portions of the great Allelujah in the words of David and Asaph the seer too; and that there was a song in heaven[k] made up of the words of Moses, and David, and Jeremy the seer; and that the apostles and the church of God always chose to do so, according to the commandment of the apostle, that we 'sing psalms and hymns to God.' I know not where we can have better than the psalms of David and Asaph, and these were ready at hand for the use of the church, insomuch that in the christian *synaxes*, particularly in the churches of Corinth, S. Paul observed that "every man had a psalm;" it was then the common devotion and liturgy of all the faithful, and so for ever; and the fathers of the fourth council of Toledo[l] justified the practice of the church in recitation of the psalms and hymns by the example of Christ and His apostles who

[h] [Opp., tom. iv. p. 3. 8vo. Oxon. 1833.]

[i] [With the rest of this preface, compare Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. 19—49.]

[j] [2 Chron. xxix. 30.]

[k] [Apoc. xv; Exod. xv; Psalm cxlv; Jer. x. 6, 7.]

[l] [can. xiii. tom. iii. col. 583.]

'after supper sung a psalm;' and the church did also make hymns of her own in the honour of Christ, and sung them; such as was the *Te Deum* made by S. Ambrose and S. Augustine: and they stood her in great stead not only as acts of direct worship to Christ, but as conservators of the articles of Christ's divinity, of which the fathers made use against the heretic Artemon, as appears in Eusebius, *lib.* v. *c.* 28. *Eccles. Hist.*[m]

21. That reading the scripture was part of the liturgy of the apostolical ages, we find it in the tenth[n] canon of the apostles, in Albinus Flaccus[o], Rabanus Maurus[p], and in the liturgy attributed to S. James[q]. *Deinde leguntur fusissime oracula sacra veteris Testamenti et prophetarum, et Filii Dei incarnatio demonstratur, passio, resurrectio ex mortuis, ascensus in cœlum, secundus item adventus ejus cum gloria; atque id fit singulis diebus, &c.*

22. So that since thus far the matter of our devotions is warranted by God's spirit, and the form by the precedents of scripture too and the ages apostolical, above half of the English liturgy is as divine as scripture itself, and the choice of it for practice is no less than apostolical.

23. Of the same consideration is the Lord's prayer, commanded by our blessed Saviour in two evangelists: the Introit is the Psalm xcv., and the responsories of morning and evening prayer, ejaculations taken from the words of David and Hezekiah; the decalogue recited in the Communion is the ten words of Moses, and without peradventure was not taken into the office in imitation of the Roman; for although it was done upon great reason, and considering the great ignorance of the people they were to inform, yet I think it was never in any church office before, but in manuals and catechisms only: yet they are made liturgic by the suffrages at the end of every commandment, and need no other warrant from antiquity but the xx. chapter of Exodus. There are not many parts beside, and they which are derive themselves from an elder house than the Roman offices; the *Gloria Patri*[r] was composed by the Nicene council, the latter versicle by S. Hierome, though some eminently learned, and in particular Baronius, is of an opinion that it was much more ancient. It was at first a confession of faith, and used by a newly baptized convert and the standers by; and then it came to be a hymn, and very early annexed to the antiphones, and afterwards to the psalms and hymns, all except that of S. Ambrose beginning with *Te Deum*, because that of itself is a great doxology. It is seven times used in the Greek office of baptism, and in the recitation of it the priest and people stood all up and turned to the east; and this custom ever continued

[m] [p. 251 sqq.]
[n] [al. vii. p. 443.]
[o] [De divin. off., cap. xxix. (p. 1074) et passim.]
[p] [vid. p. 243. not. q, infra.]
[q] [See Palmer's Antiquities of the English Ritual, Dissertation, &c. § 1.]
[r] [Bona De reb. liturg., lib. ii. cap. 8.]

in the church, and is still retained in the church of England, in conformity to the ancient and primitive custom, save only that in the litany we kneel, which is a more humble posture, but not so ancient, the litanies having usually been said walking, not kneeling or standing; but in this the variety is an ornament to the church's garment. S. Gregory added this doxology to the responsory at the beginning of prayer, after "O Lord, make haste to help us;" that was the last, and yet above a thousand years old, and much elder than the body of popery. And as for the latter part of the doxology, I am clearly of opinion that though it might by S. Hierome be brought into the Latin church, yet it was in the Greek church before him; witness that most ancient hymn or doxology, Καί σοι τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν. However, as to the matter of the doxology, it is no other than the confession of the three most blessed Persons of the Trinity, which Christ commanded, and which with greatest solemnity we declare in baptism; and certainly we can no ways better or more solemnly and ritually give glory to the holy Trinity than by being baptized into the profession and service of it. The *Trisagion* was taught to the Greek church by angels; but certain it is it sprang not from a Roman fountain; and that the canon of our Communion is the same with the old canon of the church, many hundred years before popery had invaded the simplicity of christian religion, is evident if we compare the particulars recited by S. Basil[s], Innocentius[t] his epistle to John archbishop of Lyons, Honorius[u] the priest, Alcuinus[x], and Walafridus Strabo[y]; and if we will we may add the liturgy said to be S. James's[z], and the constitution of S. Clement[a] (for whoever was the author of these, certainly they were ancient), Radulphus Tongrensis[b]; and the later ritualists, Cassander, Pamelius, Hittorpius, Jacobus Goar, and the rest.

24. And that we may be yet more particular, the very prayer for Christ's catholic church in the office of Communion, beside that it is nothing but a plain execution of an apostolical precept set down in preface of the prayer, it was also used in all times and in all liturgies of the ancient church. And we find this attested by S. Cyril of Jerusalem[c], *Deinde postquam confectum est illud spirituale sacrificium, obsecramus Deum pro communi ecclesiarum pace, pro tranquillitate mundi, pro regibus, &c.* To the same purpose also there is a testimony in S. Chrysostom[d], which because it serves not only here but

[s] De Spir. Sanct., cap. xxvii. [tom. iii. p. 54 sqq.]

[t] De celebratione missarum, c. 'Cum Marthæ.' [Innoc. iii. Decret. const., lib. iii. const. 132. tom. ii. p. 762 sqq.]

[u] In Gemma animi, lib. i. cap. 86. [in Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. xii. part. i. p. 1029 F.]

[x] De divin. offic. [cap. xl. p. 1095 sqq.]

[y] Super Act. xx. 'Una autem sabbati.' [scil. in libro 'De reb. eccles.,' cap. xxii. Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. ix. part. i. p. 959.]

[z] [vid. not. q, supra.]

[a] Lib. viii. cap. 17. [fol. 138 sq.]

[b] [De can. observ. prop. xxii. Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. xi. p. 454 sqq.]

[c] Mystagog. catechis. v. [p. 325 sqq.]

[d] Hom. vi. in 1 Epist. ad Tim. [tom. xi. p. 579.]

also to other uses, it will not be amiss here to note it; *Quid autem sibi vult primum omnium? In obsequio scilicet quotidiano, perpetuoque divinæ religionis ritu. Atque id noverunt fideles, quomodo diebus singulis, mane et vespere, orationes fundantur ad Dominum; quomodo pro omni mundo et regibus, et omnibus qui in sublimitate positi sunt, obsecrationes in ecclesia fiant. Sed forte quis dixerit, pro omnibus quod ait, tantum fideles intelligi voluisse: at id verum non esse quæ sequuntur ostendunt. Denique ait, pro regibus; neque enim tunc reges Deum colebant.* It is evident by this that the custom of the church was, not only in the celebration of the holy Communion but in all her other offices, to say this prayer not only for Christ's catholic church but for all the world;

25. And that the charity of the church might not be misconstrued, he produces his warrant; S. Paul not only expressly commands us to pray 'for all men,' but adds by way of instance, 'for kings,' who then were unchristian and heathen in all the world. But this form of prayer is almost word for word in S. Ambrose[e]. *Hæc regula ecclesiastica est, tradita a magistro gentium, qua utuntur sacerdotes nostri, ut pro omnibus supplicent, deprecantes pro regibus, . . orantes pro iis quibus sublimis potestas est credita, ut in justitia et veritate gubernent, . . postulantes pro iis qui in necessitate varia sunt, ut eruti et liberati Deum collaudent incolumitatis auctorem.* So far goes our form of prayer. But S. Ambrose adds, *Referentes quoque gratiarum actiones.* And so it was with us in the first service-books of king Edward, and the preface to the prayer engages us to a thanksgiving; but I know not how it was stolen out[f], the preface still remaining, to chide their unwariness that took down that part of the building and yet left the gate standing. But if the reader please to be satisfied concerning this prayer, which indeed is the longest in our service-book, and of greatest consideration, he may see it taken up from the universal custom of the church, and almost in all the words of the old liturgies[g], if he will observe the liturgies themselves of S. Basil[h], S. Chrysostom[i], and the concurrent testimonies of Tertullian[k], S. Austin[l], Celestine[m], Gennadius[n], Prosper[o], and Theophylact[p].

26. I shall not need to make any excuses for the church's reading those portions of scripture which we call epistles and gospels, before

[e] In Comment. [in 1 Tim. ii. 1 sqq. tom. ii. append. col. 292 C.]

[f] [Restored briefly, A.D. 1661. "And we also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear."]

[g] [The noble composition from which our own is condensed is given in Bingham (from the Apostolical Constitutions) bk. xv. chap. 3. § 1.]

[h] [tom. ii. pp. 674 sqq.]

[i] [tom. xii. p. 776 sq.]

[k] Apologet., cap. xiv. [item xxx. sq., xxxix. pp. 27, 31.]

[l] Epist. lix. [al. cxlix.] ad Paulin. [tom. ii. col. 509 sq.]

[m] Ep. 1. [cap. 8. p. 474.]

[n] De Dogmat. Eccles., cap. 30. [p. 16 sq. 4to. Hamb. 1614.]

[o] De vocat. gent., lib. i. cap. 4. [leg. 12.—Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. v. part. 3. p. 167.]

[p] In Comment. [in 1 Tim. ii. 1. p. 754.]

the Communion. They are scriptures of the choicest and most profitable transaction. And let me observe this thing, that they are not only declarations of all the mysteries of our redemption and rules of good life, but this choice is of the greatest compliance with the necessities of the christian church that can be imagined. For if we deny to the people a liberty of reading scriptures, may they not complain as Isaac did against the inhabitants of the land, that the Philistines had spoiled his well and the fountains of living water? if a free use to all of them and of all scriptures were permitted, should not the church herself have more cause to complain of the infinite licentiousness and looseness of interpretations, and of the commencement of ten thousand errors, which would certainly be consequent to such permission? Reason and religion will chide us in the first, reason and experience in the latter. And can the wit of man conceive a better temper and expedient than that such scriptures only or principally should be laid before them all in daily offices, which contain in them all the mysteries of our redemption and all the rules of good life? which two things are done by the gospels and epistles respectively, the first being a record of the life and death of our blessed Saviour, the latter instructions for the edification of the church in pious and christian conversation; and all this was done with so much choice, that as obscure places are avoided by design as much as could be, so the very assignation of them to certain festivals, the appropriation of them to solemn and particular days, does entertain the understandings of the people with notions proper to the mystery, and distinct from impertinent and vexatious questions. And were this design made something more minute and applicable to the various necessities of times, and such choice scriptures permitted indifferently which might be matter of necessity and great edification, the people of the church would have no reason to complain that the fountains of our Saviour were stopped from them, nor the rulers of the church that the mysteriousness of scripture were abused by the petulancy of the people to consequents harsh, impious, and unreasonable, in despite of government, in exauctoration of the power of superiors, or for the commencement of schisms and heresies. The church with great wisdom hath first held this torch out, and though for great reasons intervening and hindering it cannot be reduced to practice, yet the church hath shewn her desire to avoid the evil that is on both hands, and she hath shewn the way also, if it could have been insisted in. But however, this choice of the more remarkable portions of scripture is so reasonable and proportionable to the nature of the thing, that because the gospels and epistles bear their several shares of the design, the gospel representing the foundation and prime necessities of christianity, and the mysterious parts of our redemption, the sum, the faith, and the hopes of christianity, therefore it is attested by a ceremony of standing up, it being a part of the confession of faith: but the epistles containing superstructures upon that

foundation, are read with religious care, but not made formal or solemn by any other circumstance. The matter contains in it sufficient of reason and of proportion, but nothing of necessity, except it be by accident, and as authority does intervene by way of sanction.

27. But that this reading of epistles and gospels before the communion was one of the earliest customs of the church, I find it affirmed by Rabanus Maurus[q]. *Sed enim in initio mos iste cantandi non erat qui nunc in ecclesia ante sacrificium celebratur, sed tamen epistolæ Pauli recitabantur et sanctum evangelium,* 'the custom of reading S. Paul's epistles, and the holy gospel, before the sacrament, was from the beginning.' Some other portions of scripture were read upon emergent occasions instead of the epistle, which still retain the name of epistle; but it is so seldom, that it happens upon two sundays only in the year, upon Trinity sunday and the twenty-fifth sunday after; upon saints' days it happens oftener, because the story requires a particular rememoration, and therefore is very often taken out of the Acts of the apostles, but being in substitution only of the ordinary portion of the epistle of S. Paul or other the apostles, it keeps the name of the first design, though the change be upon good reason and much propriety.

28. There remains now nothing but the litany and collects to be accounted for: for the Matter of which I shall need to say nothing, because the objections whatsoever have been against them are extremely low, and rather like the intemperate talk of an angry child than pressures of reason or probability, excepting where they are charged with their virtues, for their charity in praying for all men, for their humility in acknowledging such a worthlessness in ourselves, as not to dare to ask our petitions upon our own confidences. These things fall like water against a rock, or like the accusations against our blessed Saviour; the unreasonableness of them splits themselves.

29. But for the Form, I think themselves will make answer, when they consider that they are nothing but a pursuit of that apostolical precept which, next to the Lord's prayer, was the first scripture pattern[r] whence the church framed her liturgies, "First of all let there be made intercessions, and prayers, and supplications, and giving of thanks, for all men;" in which words if there be not an impertinent repetition of divers words to the same sense, then needs must δεήσεις, προσευχαὶ, ἐντεύξεις, be as much distinct from each other in their form, as they are all from εὐχαριστίαι.

30. S. Augustine[s] expounds προσευχὰς, 'prayers made in and about the blessed eucharist;' *ideo in hujus sanctificatione et distributionis præparatione existimo apostolum jussisse proprie fieri* προσευ-

[q] Institut. Cleric., lib. i. cap. 32. [tom. vi. p. 13 C.]
[r] [1 Tim. ii. 1.]
[s] Epist. lix. ad Paulin., q. 5. [not. l, supra.]

χὰς, *id est, orationes; interpellationes autem vel postulationes fiunt, cum populus benedicitur.*

31. But S. Augustine, if he were not deceived in his criticism, says that besides the general name of prayer, which is signified by all those words, εὐχὴ in scripture signifies *votum* or desire, such surely as we express by sudden and short emissions, and then προσευχὴ is but a prayer πρὸς εὐχὴν, that is, but an expression of short and ejaculatory desires, and may be better applied to such forms of prayer as are our collects, rather than the longer and more solemn parts of the canon of Communion. Ἐντεύξεις though it signifies an address to God, yet it may with propriety enough be applied to our interlocutory prayers where the people bear a share; for ἐντεύξεις signifies *congressum* or *colloquium; τὰς ἐντεύξεις μὴ πυκνὰς ποιοῦ τοῖς αὐτοῖς*, Isocrates[t]; 'make no frequent societies or confederations with them.' However, although grammarians may differ in assigning these several words to their proper, minute, and incommunicable signification, yet it is most clear that they mean not prayers distinct and made several by the variety of matter, but several addresses differing only in *modo orandi*, and therefore by these are intended the several forms of prayer and supplication: and the church hath at all times used prayers of all variety, long and short, ejaculatory, determined, and solemn. And the church of England understood it in this variety, calling the short ejaculatory prayers and responsories by the names of litanies or suffrages, which I should render in the phrase of S. Austin to be *postulationes* or δεήσεις, but the longer collects he calls 'prayers,' which is the true rendering of προσευχὰς I suppose, and therefore twice in the litany after the short responsories the priest says, "Let us pray," by that minding the people of the apostle's precept that 'prayer' as well as 'supplications' be made. For the litanies, it is certain the form is of great antiquity; Mamercus bishop of Vienna made solemn litanies[u] four hundred years after Christ, and he and all his diocese repeated them together: and therefore I know not what matter of doubt there can be reasonable in the form, since besides that we have the wisdom of so many ages and holy and prudent persons to confirm them, the form is made with design to represent all the needs of the catholic church, and to make the prayer itself fitted for an active and an intense devotion: and that it co-operates rarely well to these ends is so true, that of the first every man is judge; of the second, every man may be judge that will without prejudice and with pious predispositions use the form; for if they help my devotion infinitely, they may do as much to another if he be disposed as I am, and he that says they do no advantage or singular relish to my spirit may as well tell me the meat I eat does not please me because he loves it not. But the exceptions which are against it are so fantastic and by chance, that unless it be against a single adversary and by personal engagement, they cannot be noted in a series of a positive discourse: some-

[t] [Orat. i. ad Demon., p. 6.]

[u] [Greg. Turon. hist., lib. ii. cap. 34.]

times they are too long, and sometimes they are too short, and yet the objectors will make longer and shorter when they please; and because no law of God hath prescribed to us in such circumstances, if the church leaves the same liberty to their private devotions, it is not reasonable they should prescribe to her in public, and in such minutes in which the ordinary prudence of one wise man is abundantly sufficient to give him laws and directions, and in matters of greater difficulty.

32. Of the same consideration is the form of our church collects, which are made pleasant by their variety of matter, are made energetical and potent by that great endearment of *per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum,* are cleared from a neighbourhood of tediousness by their so quick intercision and breakings off, and have for their precedent the forms of prayer used by the Religious of Palestine mentioned by Cassian[x], *Et hæ fuerunt monachorum jaculatoriæ orationes, ut frequentius Dominum deprecantes jugiter eidem cohærere possimus, et ut insidiantis diaboli jacula, quæ infligere nobis tum præcipue insistit cum oramus, succincta vitemus brevitate.* In all these forms of prayer there is no difference but what is circumstantial; and therefore although these circumstances be of great efficacy for the procuring of accidental advantages to our spirits, which are often swayed, moved, and determined by a manner as much as by an essence, yet there is in it nothing of duty and obligation, and therefore it is the most unreasonable thing in the world to make any of these things to be a question of religion.

33. I shall therefore press these things no further, but note that since all liturgy is, and ever was, either prose or verse, or both, and the liturgy of the church of England, as well as most others, is of the last sort, I consider that whatsoever is in her devotions besides the lessons, epistles, and gospels (the body of which is no other thing than was the famous *Lectionarium* of S. Hierome) is a compliance with these two dictates of the apostle for liturgy: the which, one for verse, the other for prose,—'in [1]) psalms and [2]) hymns and [3]) spiritual songs' for verse, for prose '[4]) deprecations and [5]) prayers and [6]) intercessions and [7]) giving of thanks,'—will warrant and commend, as so many parts of duty, all the portions of the English liturgy.

34. If it were worth the pains, it were very easy to enumerate the authors, and especially the occasions and time when the most minute passages, such I mean as are known by distinct appellatives, came into the church; that so it may appear our liturgy is as ancient and primitive in every part as it is pious and unblamable, and long before the church got such a beam in one of her eyes which was endeavoured to be cast out at the Reformation. But it will not be amiss to observe that very many of them were inserted as antidotes and deleteries to

[x] De Instit. Cleric., lib. i. c. 32. [vid. p. 243. not. q, supra.—Cassian. De cœnob. inst., lib. ii. cap. 10 fin.; et Coll. ix. cap. 36, cum nota Gazæi, pp. 31, 531.]

the worst of heresies, as I have discoursed already: and such was that clause, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, ever one God;" and some other phrases parallel were put in, in defiance of the Macedonians, and all the species of the Anti-trinitarians, and used by S. Ambrose in Milan, S. Austin in Africa, and Idacius Clarus in Spain; and in imitation of so pious precedents the church of England hath inserted divers clauses into her offices.

35. There was a great instance in the administration of the blessed sacrament. For upon the change of certain clauses in the liturgy upon the instance of Martin Bucer, instead of 'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for you, preserve your body and soul unto everlasting life,' was substituted this, 'Take and eat this in remembrance,' &c.; and it was done lest the people, accustomed to the opinion of transubstantiation and the appendent practices, should retain the same doctrine upon intimation of the first clause. But in the beginning of queen Elizabeth's reign, when certain persons of the Zuinglian opinion would have abused the church with sacramentary doctrine, and pretended the church of England had declared for it in the second clause of 1552, the wisdom of the church thought it expedient to join both the clauses, the first lest the church should be suspected to be of the sacramentary opinion, the latter lest she should be mistaken as a patroness of transubstantiation; and both these with so much temper and sweetness that by her care she rather prevented all mistakes, than by any positive declaration in her prayers engaged herself upon either side, that she might pray to God without strife and contention with her brethren. For the church of England had never known how to follow the names of men, but to call Christ only her 'Lord and Master.'

36. But from the inserting of these and the like clauses, which hath been done in all ages according to several opportunities and necessities, I shall observe this advantage, which is in many, but is also very signally in the English liturgy: we are thereby enabled and advantaged in the meditation of those mysteries *de quibus festivatur in sacris*, as the casuists love to speak, 'which upon solemn days we are bound to meditate,' and make to be the matter and occasion of our address to God; for the offices are so ordered that the most indifferent and careless cannot but be reminded of the mystery in every anniversary, which if they be summed up will make an excellent creed: and then let any man consider what a rare advantage it will be to the belief of such propositions, when the very design of the holiday teaches the hard-handed artisan the name and meaning of an article, and yet the most forward and religious cannot be abused with any semblances of superstition. The life and death of the saints, which is very precious in the eyes of God, is so remembered by His humble and afflicted handmaid the church of England, that by giving Him thanks and praise, God may be honoured, the church instructed by

the proposition of their example, and we give testimony of the honour and love we owe and pay unto religion, by the pious veneration and esteem of those holy and beatified persons.

37. Certain it is that there is no part of religion, as it is a distinct virtue, and is to be exercised by interior acts and forms of worship, but is in the offices of the church of England. For if the soul desires to be humbled, she hath provided forms of confession to God before His church; if she will rejoice and give God thanks for particular blessings, there are forms of thanksgiving described and added by the king's authority upon the conference at Hampton-court, which are all the public, solemn, and foreseen occasions for which by law and order provision could be made. If she will commend to God the public and private necessities of the church and single persons, the whole body of collects and devotions supplies that abundantly: if her devotion be high and pregnant and prepared to fervency and importunity of congress with God, the litanies are an admirable pattern of devotion, full of circumstances proportionable for a quick and an earnest spirit: when the revolution of the anniversary calls on us to perform our duty of special meditation and thankfulness to God for the glorious benefits of Christ's incarnation, nativity, passion, resurrection, and ascension (blessings which do as well deserve a day of thanksgiving as any other temporal advantage, though it be the pleasure of a victory), then we have the offices of Christmas, the Annunciation, Easter, and Ascension: if we delight to remember those holy persons whose bodies rest in the bed of peace and whose souls are deposited in the hands of Christ till the day of restitution of all things, we may by the collects and days of anniversary festivity not only remember but also imitate them too in our lives, if we will make that use of the proportions of scripture allotted for the festival which the church intends: to which if we add the advantages of the whole psalter, which is an entire body of devotion by itself, and hath in it forms to exercise all graces by way of internal act and spiritual intention, there is not any ghostly advantage which the most religious can either need or fancy but the English liturgy in its entire constitution will furnish us withal. And certainly it was a very great wisdom and a very prudent and religious constitution, so to order that part of the liturgy which the ancients called the *Lectionarium* that the psalter should be read over twelve times in the year, the Old testament once, and the New testament thrice, besides the epistles and gospels, which renew with a more frequent repetition such choice places as represent the entire body of faith and good life. There is a defalcation of some few chapters from the entire body of the order; but that also was part of the wisdom of the church, not to expose to public ears and common judgments some of the secret rites of Moses' law, or the more mysterious prophecies of the New testament, whose sense and meaning the event will declare, if we by mistaken and anticipated interpretations do not

obstruct our own capacities, and hinder us from believing the true events because they answer not those expectations with which our own mistakes have prepared our understandings; as it happened to the Jews in the case of Antiochus, and to the Christians in the person of Antichrist.

38. Well; thus as it was framed in the body of its first constitution and second alteration, those excellent men whom God chose as instruments of His honour and service in the Reformation, to whom also He did shew what great things they were to suffer for His name's sake, approved of it with high testimony, promoted it by their own use and zeal, and at last sealed it with their blood.

39. That they had a great opinion of the piety and unblamable composure of the common-prayer-book, appears, 1) in the challenge made in its behalf by the archbishop Cranmer[y], to defend it against all the world of enemies; 2) by the daily using it in time of persecution and imprisonment; for so did bishop Ridley, and doctor Taylor, who also recommended it to his wife for a legacy; 3) by their preaching in behalf of it, as many did; 4) by Hulliers' hugging it in his flames, with a posture of great love and forwardness of entertainment; 5) besides the direct testimony which the most eminent learned amongst the queen-Mary martyrs have given of it. Amongst which that of the learned rector of Hadley, doctor Rowland Taylor[z], is most considerable; his words are these in a letter of his to a friend[a]. "But there was after that, set forth by the most innocent king Edward (for whom God be praised everlastingly) the whole church service, with great deliberation, and the advice of the best learned men of the realm, and authorized by the whole parliament, and received and published gladly by the whole realm; which book was never reformed but once, and yet by that one reformation it was so fully perfected according to the rules of our christian religion in every behalf, that no christian conscience could be offended with any thing therein contained: I mean of that book reformed."

40. I desire the words may be considered and confronted against some other words lately published, which charge these holy and learned men but with a half-faced light, a darkness in the confines of Egypt and the suburbs of Goshen. And because there is no such thing proved of these blessed men and martyrs, and that it is easy to say such words of any man that is not fully of our mind, I suppose the advantage and the out-weighing authority will lie on our part, in behalf of the common-prayer-book, especially since this man, and divers others, died with it and for it, according as it happened by the circumstance of their charges and articles upon which they died; for so it was in the cases[b] of John Rough, John Philpot, Cuthbert

[y] [vid. p. 238. not. h, supra.]

[z] [Ancestor of the bishop; see Life.]

[a] [Reporting what he had said to the lord Chancellor and other commissioners, in a conference January 22 A.D. 1555. Fox,] Acts and Monuments, [p. 1521. ed. fol. 1583.] pp. 1385, 1608, 1665, 1840, 1844, et alibi.

[b] Pp. 1848, 1649, 1840. [pp. 2028 sqq., 1795 sqq., 2031 sqq., and 2037 sqq.]

Simson, and seven others, burnt in Smithfield; upon whom it was charged in their indictments that they used, allowed, preached for, and maintained respectively, the service-book of king Edward. To which articles they answered affirmatively, and confessed them to be true in every part, and died accordingly.

41. I shall press this argument to issue in the words of S. Ambrose[c], cited to the like purpose by Vincentius Lirinensis[d], *Librum sacerdotalem quis nostrum resignare audeat, signatum a confessoribus, et multorum jam martyrio consecratum? .. Quomodo fidem eorum possumus denegare, quorum victoriam prædicamus?* 'Who shall dare to violate this priestly book, which so many confessors have consigned, and so many martyrs have hallowed with their blood? How shall we call them martyrs, if we deny their faith? how shall we celebrate their victory, if we dislike their cause? If we believe them to be crowned, why shall we deny but that they strove lawfully?' So that if they, dying in attestation of this book, were martyrs, why do we condemn the book for which they died? If we will not call them martyrs, it is clear we have changed our religion since then. And then it would be considered whether we are fallen; for the reformers in king Edward's time died for it, in queen Elizabeth's time they avowed it under the protection of an excellent princess; but in that sad interval of queen Mary's reign, it suffered persecution: and if it shall do so again, it is but an unhandsome compliance for reformers to be unlike their brethren and to be like their enemies, to do as do the papists, and only to speak great words against them; and it will be sad for a zealous protestant to live in an age that should disavow king Edward's and queen Elizabeth's religion and manner of worshipping God, and in an age that shall do as did queen Mary's bishops, persecute the book of common-prayer and the religion contained in it. God help the poor protestants in such times: but let it do its worst; if God please to give His grace, the worst that can come is but a crown, and that was never denied to martyrs.

42. In the mean time I can but with joy and eucharist consider with what advantages and blessings the pious protestant is entertained, and blessed, and armed against all his needs, by the constant and religious usage of the common-prayer-book: for besides the direct advantages of the prayers and devotions, some whereof are already instanced, and the experience of holy persons will furnish them with more, there are also forms of solemn Benediction and Absolution in the offices; and if they be not highly considerable, there is nothing sacred in the evangelical ministry, but all is a vast plain, and the altars themselves are made of unhallowed turf.

43. Concerning Benediction (of which there are four more solemn forms in the whole office, two in the canon of the communion, one in

[c] [De fide, lib. iii. cap. 15. tom. ii. col. 519.]

[d] Contra Hæres., cap. vii. [al. v. p. 104.]

confirmation, one in the office of marriage) I shall give this short account, that "without all question, the less is blessed of the greater[e]," and it being an issue spiritual, is rather to be verified in spiritual relation than in natural or political. And therefore if there be any such thing as 'regeneration' by the ministry of the word, and 'begetting in Christ,' and fathers, and sons after the common faith, as the expressions of the apostles make us to believe, certain it is the blessings of religion do descend most properly from our spiritual fathers, and with most plentiful emanation. And this hath been the religion of all the world, to derive very much of their blessings by the priest's particular and signal ministration: Melchisedech blessed Abraham, Isaac blessed Jacob, and Moses and Aaron blessed the people. So that here is benediction from a prince, from a father, from the Aaronical priest, from Melchisedech, of whose order is the christian; in whose law it is a sanction, that in great needs especially "the elders of the church be sent for, and let them pray over him" that is distressed[f]. That is the great remedy for the great necessity. And it was ever much valued in the church, insomuch that Nectarius[g] would by no means take investiture of his patriarchal see until he had obtained the benediction of Diodorus the bishop of Cilicia. Eudoxia the empress brought her son Theodosius to S. Chrysostom for his blessing; and St. Austin and all his company received it of Innocentius bishop of Carthage. It was so solemn in all marriages, that the marrying of persons was called 'benediction;' so it was in the fourth council of Carthage[h], *Sponsus et sponsa cum benedicendi sunt a sacerdote, &c. benedicendi* for 'married.' And in all church offices it was so solemn, that by a decree of the council of Agatha[i], A. D. 380, it was decreed, *Ante benedictionem sacerdotis populus egredi non præsumat.* By the way only, here is *ἀνθεντία* for two parts of the English liturgy, for the benediction in the office of marriage by the authority of the council of Carthage, and for concluding the office of communion with the priest's or bishop's benediction by warrant of the council of Agatha, which decrees, having been derived into the practice of the universal church for very many ages, is in no hand to be undervalued, lest we become like Esau, and we miss it when we most need it. For my own particular I shall still press on to receive the benediction of holy church, till at last I shall hear a *Venite benedicti*, and that I be reckoned amongst those blessed souls who come to God by the ministries of His own appointment, and will not venture upon that neglect against which the piety and wisdom of all religions in the world infinitely do prescribe.

44. Now the advantages of confidence which I have upon the forms of benediction in the common-prayer-book are therefore considerable, because God himself prescribed a set form of blessing the

[e] [Heb. vii. 7.]
[f] [James v. 14.]
[g] [Sozom. vii. 10.]
[h] [can. xiii. tom. i. col. 980.]
[i] [can. xlvii. tom. ii. col. 1003.]

people, appointing it to be done not in the priest's *ex tempore*, but in an established form of words[k]; and because as the authority of a prescript form is from God, so, that this form may be also highly warranted, the solemn blessing at the end of the communion is in the very words of S. Paul.

45. For the forms of Absolution in the liturgy, though I shall not enter into the consideration of the question concerning the quality of the priest's power, which is certainly a very great ministry; yet I shall observe the rare temper and proportion which the church of England uses in commensurating the forms of absolution to the degrees of preparation and necessity. At the beginning of the morning and evening prayer, after a general confession, usually recited before the devotion is high and pregnant, whose parts like fire enkindle one another, there is a form of absolution in general, declarative, and by way of proposition. In the office of the communion, because there are more acts of piety and repentance previous and presupposed, there the church's form of absolution is optative and by way of intercession. But in the visitation of the sick, when it is supposed and enjoined that the penitent shall disburden himself of all the clamorous loads upon his conscience, the church prescribes a medicinal form by way of delegate authority, that the parts of justification may answer to the parts of good life. For as the penitent proceeds, so does the church; pardon and repentance being terms of relation, they grow up together till they be complete: this the church with greatest wisdom supposes to be at the end of our life, grace by that time having all its growth that it will have here; and therefore then also the pardon of sins is of another nature than it ever was before, it being now more actual and complete, whereas before it was *in fieri*, in the beginnings and smaller increases, and upon more accidents apt to be made imperfect and revocable. So that the church of England in these manners of dispensing the power of the keys does cut off all disputings and impertinent wranglings whether the priest's power were judicial or declarative, for possibly it is both; and it is optative too, and something else yet, for it is an emanation from all the parts of his ministry, and he never absolves but he preaches, or prays, or administers a sacrament; for this power of remission is a transcendent, passing through all the parts of the priestly offices; for the keys of the kingdom of heaven are the promises and the threatenings of the scripture, and the prayers of the church, and the word, and the sacraments, and all these are to be dispensed by the priest, and these keys are committed to his ministry, and by the operation of them all he opens and shuts heaven's gates ministerially; and therefore S. Paul calls it *verbum reconciliationis*, and says it is dispensed by ministers as by 'ambassadors' or delegates: and therefore it is an excellent temper of the church so to prescribe her forms of absolution as to shew them to be results of the whole priestly

[k] [Num. vi. 23.]

office, of preaching, of dispensing sacraments, of spiritual cure, and authoritative deprecation. And the benefit which pious and well disposed persons receive by these public ministries, as it lies ready formed in our blessed Saviour's promise, *Erit solutum in cœlis*, so men will then truly understand when they are taught to value every instrument of grace or comfort by the exigence of a present need, as in a sadness of spirit, in an unquiet conscience, in the arrest of death.

---

46. I shall not need to procure advantages to the reputation of the common-prayer, by considering the imperfections of whatsoever hath been offered in its stead[1]: but yet, [1]) A form of worship composed to the dishonour of the Reformation, accusing it of darkness and intolerable inconvenience; [2]) A direction without a rule, [3]) A rule without restraint; [4]) A prescription leaving an indifferency to a possibility of licentiousness; [5]) An office without any injunction of external acts of worship, not prescribing so much as kneeling; [6]) An office that only once names reverence, but forbids it in the ordinary instance, and enjoins it in no particular; [7]) An office that leaves the form of ministration of sacraments so indifferently, that if there be any form of words essential the sacrament is in much danger to become invalid for want of provision of due forms of ministration; [8]) An office that complies with no precedent of scripture, nor of any ancient church; [9]) That must of necessity either want authority, or it must prefer novelty before antiquity; [10]) That accuses all the primitive church of indiscretion at the least; [11]) That may be abused by the indiscretion, or ignorance, or malice of any man that uses it; [12]) Into which heresy or blasphemy may creep without possibility of prevention; [13]) That hath no external forms to entertain the fancy of the more common spirits, [14]) Nor any allurement to persuade and entice its adversaries, [15]) Nor any means of adunation and uniformity amongst its confidents; [16]) An office that still permits children in many cases of necessity to be unbaptized, making no provision for them in sudden cases; [17]) That will not suffer them to be confirmed at all, *Ut utroque sacramento renascantur*, as S. Cyprian's[m] phrase is, 'that they may be advantaged by a double

[1] Directory. ["A Directory for the public worship of God throughout the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; Together with an Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and observing of this present Directory throughout the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales."

"Die Jovis 13 Martii, 1644. Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that this Ordinance and Directory be forthwith printed and published."

"Sold at the sign of the Bible in Cornhill."]

Some extracts from this work may be not uninteresting to the reader.

The preface sets forth the great harm the Liturgy had done, "to the endangering of many thousand souls;" though "prelates and their faction had laboured

[m] ['Si sacramento utroque nascantur,' ep. lxxii. ad Stephan., p. 196.]

rite;' [18]) That joins in marriage as Cacus did his oxen, in rude, inform, and unhallowed yokes; [19]) That will not do piety to the dead, nor comfort to the living, by solemn and honorary offices of funeral; [20]) That hath no forms of blessing the people, any more [21]) than 'described' forms of blessing God, which are just none at all; [22]) An office that never thinks of absolving penitents, or exercising the power of the keys, after the custom and rites of priests; [23]) A liturgy that recites no creed, no confession of faith, so not declaring either to angels or man according to what religion they worship God, but entertaining, though indeed without a symbol, Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Manichees, or any other sect, for aught there appears to the contrary; [24]) That consigns no public canon of communion, but leaves that as casual and fantastic as any of the lesser offices; [25]) An office that takes no more care than chance does for the reading the holy scriptures; [26]) That never commemorates a departed saint; [27]) That hath no communion with the church triumphant any more than with the other parts of the militant; [28]) That never thanks God for the redemption of the world by the nativity and passion, resurrection and ascension of our blessed Saviour Jesus, but condemns the memorial even of the scripture saints, and the memorial of the miraculous blessings of redemption of mankind by Christ himself, with the same accusation it condemns the legends and portentous stories of the most suspected part of the Roman calendar; [29]) An office that out of zeal against Judaism condemns all distinction of days, unless they themselves distinguish them: that leaves no signature of piety upon the Lord's day, and yet the compilers do enjoin it to a Judaical superstition; [30]) An office that does by implication undervalue the Lord's prayer, for it never enjoins it, and does but once permit it; [31]) An office that is new without authority, and never made up into a sanction by an act of parliament: an order or 'Directory' of devotion that hath all these ingredients and capacities (and such a one there is in the world) I suppose is no equal match to contest with and be put in balance against the liturgy of the church of England, which was with so great deliberation compiled out of scriptures, the most of it; all the rest agreeing with scriptures, and drawn from the liturgies of the ancient church, and made by men famous in their generations, whose repu-

to raise the estimation of it."

"Reading of the word in the congregation is to be performed by the pastors and teachers, howbeit such as intend the ministry may occasionally both read the word and exercise their gift of preaching in the congregation if allowed by the presbytery thereunto."

"How large a portion shall be read at once is left to the wisdom of the minister;" "We command also the more frequent reading of such Scriptures as he that readeth shall think best for edification of his hearers," &c.

For the *ex tempore* prayer before the sermon, topics are suggested, extending through several pages; among them, to ask a "blessing on the Churches and kingdom of England, Scotland, and Ireland, now more strictly and religiously united in the solemn national league and covenant; .. for the king's majesty; .. for the conversion of the queen; .. for the comforting of the afflicted queen of

tation and glory of martyrdom hath made it immodest for the best of men now to compare themselves with them; and after its composition, considered by advices from abroad, and so trimmed and adorned that no excrescency did remain; the rubrics of which book was writ in the blood of many of the compilers, which hath had a testimony from God's blessing in the daily use of it, accompanying it with the peace of an age, established and confirmed by six acts of parliament directly and collaterally, and is of so admirable a composure, that the most industrious wits of its enemies could never find out an objection of value enough to make a doubt, or scarce a scruple, in a wise spirit. But that I shall not need to set a night-piece by so excellent a beauty to set it off the better, its own excellencies are orators prevalent enough, that it shall not need any advantages accidental.

47. And yet this excellent book hath had the fate to be cut in pieces with a pen-knife, and thrown into the fire, but it is not consumed; at first it was sown in tears, and is now watered with tears, yet never was any holy thing drowned and extinguished with tears. It began with the martyrdom of the compilers, and the church hath been vexed ever since by angry spirits, and she was forced to defend it with much trouble and unquietness; but it is to be hoped, that all these storms are sent but to increase the zeal and confidence of the pious sons of the church of England. Indeed the greatest danger that ever the common-prayer-book had, was the indifferency and indevotion of them that used it but as a common blessing; and they who thought it fit for the meanest of the clergy to read prayers, and for themselves only to preach, though they might innocently intend it, yet did not in that action consult the honour of our liturgy, except where charity or necessity did interpose. But when excellent things go away, and then look back upon us, as our blessed Saviour did upon S. Peter, we are more moved than by the nearer embraces of a full and an actual possession. I pray God it may prove so in our case, and that we may not be too willing to be discouraged; at least that we may not cease to love and to desire what is not publicly permitted to our practice and profession.

JER. TAYLOR.

Bohemia," &c. And in the prayer after the sermon, the preacher is "to turn the chief and most useful heads of the sermon into some few petitions."

In the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, the minister is in beginning "to use some words of instruction, . . . shewing," among other things, "That children are by baptism solemnly received into the bosom of the visible Church, . . . that they are Christians and federally holy before baptism, and therefore are they baptized," &c.

As to the manner of the ceremony it is declared that the "most expedient" is by "powring or sprinckling of the water on the face of the child," &c.

In the administration of the Lord's Supper "the table is to be decently covered, and so conveniently placed, that the communicants may orderly sit about it or at it," &c.

The words of institution are to be

A LETTER FROM JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.

ADDRESSED TO

BISHOP LESLIE[a].

MY LORD,

I AM well pleased your Lordship hath consented to publish your excellent sermons concerning *ex tempore* prayer. You preached them in a family in which the public liturgy of the church is greatly valued and diligently used, but in a country where most of the inhabitants are strangers to the thing, and enemies to the name, for so they are taught to be; having no other reason for that enmity than because their preachers have blasted it with the breath of their displeasure. But instead of this, they are fed with indeliberate, unstudied, sudden conceptions, begotten and born in the same minute, and therefore not likely to be better than all those other productions of the world which by being sudden and hasty have an inevitable fate to be useless and good for nothing.

read, "which the minister may when he seeth requisite explain and apply."

Touching the burial of the dead, "when any person departeth this life, let the dead body upon the day of burial be decently attended from the house to the place appointed for public burial, and there immediately interred without any ceremony."

In an "Appendix touching days and places for public worship," "Festival days, vulgarly called Holy days, having no warrant in the word of God, are not to be continued."

The lawfulness of using the ancient churches is thus settled,—"As no place is capable of any holiness under pretence of whatsoever dedication or consecration, so neither is it subject to such pollution by any superstition formerly used and now laid aside, as may render it unlawful or inconvenient for Christians to meet together therein for the public worship of God."]

[a] [Prefixed by Bp. Leslie to a publication of his own, entitled,

A Discourse of
Praying with the Spirit
and with the Understanding.
where
of { Extemporary / Premeditate / Set forms of } Prayer.
Preached in two sermons at Hillsborough,
Anno. 1659.
By Henry Leslie, (maugre all Anti-christian opposition) Bishop of Down and Conner.
And now published for the Redresse of the great abuse of Prayer in that Diocesse, whereof he had, and ought to have a charge.
Whereunto is annexed
A Letter of Jer. Taylor, D.D.,
concerning the same subject,
Eccles. v. 2.—"Be not rash," &c.
London.
Printed for John Crooke, and are to be sold at the Ship in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1660.]

My Lord, I have often considered concerning the pretensions of those persons who think no prayer is good if it be studied, and none spiritual unless it be *ex tempore*, and that only such are made by the spirit: and perceiving them to rely upon the expression of S. Paul, "I will pray with the spirit," I have thought that they as little study what they teach to men as what they say to God; for if they did not understand with the spirit in the same sense as they pray with the spirit, that is, without all study and consideration, I am verily persuaded they would not have fallen upon this new and unheard-of practice; I say unheard-of, for it is a new thing both to heathens, to Jews, and to Christians; and indeed must be so, since,

1. In the very nature of the thing itself it appears to be infinitely unreasonable; for what greater disparagement in the world can there be to him that speaks, or the thing spoken, than to say it was spoken rashly and inconsiderately? And therefore it was an excellent saying of one[b], *Oratio viri philosophi, sicut vita, debet esse composita,* 'every wise man's words should be composed and orderly as his life;' μετὰ πολλῆς σκέψεως καὶ πόνου[c], 'with labour and consideration.' And certain it is, if any man intends to speak well and wisely, he does not vomit out his answers as a fool does secrets, he is sick till they are out, and when they are they are loathsome. Of this I need say no more; but it is evident all such *ex tempore* prayers are likely to be less wise; and to use such ways of prayer is against reason.

2. To do so is against the virtue of religion: it is doing the work of the Lord negligently, and therefore unpleasantly; and to this is to be imputed all those unhandsome issues of a sudden tongue, which so ill become religion, that they very often minister offence to wise and godly persons of all persuasions.

3. Hasty and unstudied prayers are against scripture; expressly, I say, against the word of God, whose Spirit hath commanded thus, "Be not rash with thy mouth, and be not hasty to utter any thing before God[d]." Now this commandment is plain and easy, and therefore not to be evacuated by any obscure and difficult pretences from which no certain argument can arise. To which if we add that S. Paul amongst the characters of these of whom he prophesies evil things reckons προπετεῖς, the 'hasty and heady' people[e]; I humbly conceive that these are the persons in the New testament who break the commandment in the Old, and that they must have something else to defend them than what hath yet appeared.—But therefore these our brethren pretend that the Spirit of God supplies all this, and what is wanting in nature is supplied by grace. To this I need to make no new replies, but only consider that where there is an unavoidable necessity, we have reason to suppose we shall be helped: but we have no such need; we are taught in scripture by the Holy Spirit what to pray, and how to pray, and beyond this assistance we

[b] [Sen., ep. xl. tom. ii. p. 137.]
[c] [Proœres. apud Eunap., tom. i. p. 82.]
[d] [Eccl. v. 2.]
[e] [2 Tim. iii. 4.]

need nothing save only that He be pleased to stir us up to pray; and for that also we have arguments and invitations sufficient in the divine scripture; and I humbly conceive it is one sort of tempting God to call for extraordinary aids when we are sufficiently provided for in ordinary; and I appeal to the piety and consciences of all christian ministers [1]) whether the Spirit of God hath not sufficiently enabled us in all the parts and necessities of prayer by the treasures of holy scripture? and [2]) whether by reading and meditating in the scriptures we cannot obtain all the aid we need? and [3]) whether or no, do not those ministers that are supposed to pray best amongst them most of all use the phrases and expressions of scripture? and [4]) whether or no, are not such prayers undeniably the best which are taken thence?

4. But that I need no further argument in this question, I appeal to the experience of this last age in which *ex tempore* prayers have been born and bred, whether it can be reasonable to allow such sudden prayers to be productions of the Spirit, when we have heard many spiritual crimes expressed and promoted by such prayers, and by those that pretended to such gifts? The consequence of which is certainly this; that to prove a man to pray with the spirit something else is required besides speaking *ex tempore*, and that this is not therefore it, because many do this who do like Ananias and Sapphira ψεύσασθαι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, 'belie,' or 'falsely pretend the Spirit;' who cannot dictate false, heretical, rebellious, blasphemous, or ignorant propositions: and yet it is certain if these men who pray *ex tempore* did pray with the Spirit, that is, if the Spirit of God did dictate those words, those prayers would be as good canonical scripture when they are written by the short-hand writers as any of the psalms of David, or the words of the apostles; which because it is intolerable to affirm, it follows that praying with the Spirit means not *ex tempore* prayers.

5. I add but one thing more, and that is that Didoclavius the great patron of our dissenting brethren said in his *Altare Damascenum*[f] that the master of a family could not without indecency pray with such sudden conception before a family; and as wise a man as he said[g] *Nihil ordinatum est quod præcipitatur; . . properari sine indecoro non potest*, 'there can be no order in sudden conception.' Since therefore it is indecent and unorderly, let it be considered how such persons can observe the precept of the apostle[h], "Let all things," in the church, "be done decently and in order."

If it be asked by any man, Whether it be unfit to use in private forms of our own composing? I answer, it may be very fit; but this is because this rule of the apostle, which wholly relates to the public, is not a provision for the private, for decency is a relative term, and

[f] [cap. x. p. 614. ed. 4to. 1623.] vid. Didoclav. ubi supra.]
[g] Seneca. [ep. xl. tom. ii. p. 137; et [h] [1 Cor. xiv. 40.]

so is order; and in private we may deliberate upon our knees, but in public we cannot; and although we must neither in public nor in private speak hastily, rashly, or without sufficient deliberation, yet we may do that in private which in public we may not; and there we are only to avoid rashness and hastiness, but in public we must take care of order also, and of decency, and of edification of others, all which by *ex tempore* prayers cannot be well provided for; but my lord, I forget the purpose of my letter, which is to pay to your lordship that just acknowledgment of your care of the church's good and the instruction of souls which you have expressed in this material, plain, easy, and religious discourse, which I pray God may prove as profitable as it is rational, as useful as it is pious.

My lord, I am

your lordship's

most affectionate brother and servant,

J. T.

AN

APOLOGY

FOR

AUTHORIZED AND SET FORMS OF LITURGY.

Hierocl. in Pythag.[a]

Χωρεῖν γὰρ ἀνάγκη τὸ ὅμοιον πρὸς τὸ ὅμοιον· ὅθεν καὶ μόνος ἱερεὺς ὁ σόφος λέγεται, μόνος θεοφιλὴς, μόνος εἰδὼς εὔξασθαι· μόνος γὰρ οἶδε τιμᾶν, ὁ τὴν ἀξίαν μὴ συγχέων τῶν τιμωμένων, καὶ ὁ προηγουμένως ἱερεῖον ἑαυτὸν προσάγων.

§ 1. I HAVE read over this book which the Assembly of Divines is pleased to call, 'The Directory for Prayer.' I confess I came to it with much expectation, and was in some measure confident I should have found it an exact and unblamable model of devotion, free from all those objections which men of their own persuasion had obtruded against the public liturgy of the church of England; or at least it should have been composed with so much artifice and fineness that it might have been to all the world an argument of their learning and excellency of spirit, if not of the goodness and integrity of their religion and purposes. I shall give no other character of the whole but that the public disrelish which I find amongst persons of great piety of all qualities, not only of great but even of ordinary understandings, is to me some argument that it lies so open to the objections even of common spirits, that the compilers of it did intend more to prevail by the success of their armies than the strength of reason and the proper grounds of persuasion, which yet most wise and good men believe to be the more christian way of the two. But because the judgment I made of it from an argument so extrinsical to the nature of the thing could not reasonably enable me to satisfy those many persons who in their behalf desired me to consider it, I resolve to look upon it nearer, and to take its account from something that was ingredient to its constitution, 'that I might be able both to exhort and convince the gainsayers,' who refuse to hold fast *πιστὸν λόγον κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν*, that 'faithful word which they had been taught' by their mother the church of England.

§ 2. I shall decline to speak of the efficient cause of this Directory,

[a] [p. 24.]

and not quarrel at it that it was composed against the laws both of England and all christendom. If the thing were good and pious, and did not directly or accidentally invade the rights of a just superior, I would learn to submit to the imposition, and never quarrel at the incompetency of his authority that engaged me to do pious and holy things. And it may be when I am a little more used to it I shall not wonder at a synod in which not one bishop sits in the capacity of a bishop, though I am most certain this is the first example in England since it was first christened: but for the present it seems something hard to digest it, because I know so well that all assemblies of the church have admitted priests to consultation and dispute, but never to authority and decision, till the pope enlarging the phylacteries of the archimandrites and abbots, did sometime by way of privilege and dispensation give to some of them decisive voices in public councils; but this was one of the things in which he did innovate and invade against the public resolutions of christendom, though he durst not do it often, and yet when he did it it was in very small and inconsiderable numbers.

§ 3. I said I would not meddle with the efficient, and I cannot meddle with the final cause, nor guess at any other ends and purposes of theirs than at what they publicly profess, which is the abolition and destruction of the Book of Common Prayer; which great change because they are pleased to call Reformation, I am content in charity to believe they think it so, and that they have *zelum Dei*, but whether *secundum scientiam*, 'according to knowledge,' or no, must be judged by them who consider the MATTER and the FORM.

§ 4. But because the MATTER is of so great variety and minute consideration, every part whereof would require as much scrutiny as I purpose to bestow upon the whole, I have for the present chosen to consider only the FORM of it; concerning which I shall give my judgment without any sharpness or bitterness of spirit; for I am resolved not to be angry with any men of another persuasion, as knowing that I differ just as much from them as they do from me[b].

§ 5. The Directory takes away that form of prayer which by the authority and consent of all the obliging power of the kingdom hath been used and enjoined ever since the Reformation. But this was done by men of differing spirits and of disagreeing interests; some of them consented to it that they might take away all set forms of prayer, and give way to every man's spirit; the other, that they might take away this form, and give way and countenance to their own. The first is an enemy to all deliberation, the second to all authority: they will have no man to deliberate, these would have none but themselves: the former are unwise and rash, the latter are pleased with themselves, and are full of opinion. They must be considered apart, for they have rent the question in pieces, and with the fragment in his hand every man hath run his own way.

[b] [Cf. Bp. Butler, Sermon xii. 'Upon the Love of our neighbour.']

QUESTION I.

§ 6. FIRST, of them that deny all set forms, though in the subject matter they were confessed innocent and blameless.

§ 7. And here I consider that the true state of the question is only this, Whether it is better to pray to God with consideration or without? Whether is the wiser man of the two, he who thinks and deliberates what to say, or he that utters his mind as fast as it comes? Whether is the better man, he who out of reverence to God is most careful and curious that he offend not in his tongue, and therefore he himself deliberates, and takes the best guides he can; or he who out of the confidence of his own abilities or other exterior assistances ὅμοιος εἶη τοῖς εἰκῇ καὶ φορτικῶς καὶ χύδην ὅ τι ἂν ἐπέλθῃ λέγουσιν[c], speaks whatever comes uppermost.

§ 8. And here I have[d] the advice and counsel of a very wise man, no less than Solomon[e], "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few." The consideration of the vast distance between God and us, heaven and earth, should create such apprehensions in us, that the very best and choicest of our offertories are not acceptable but by God's gracious vouchsafing and condescension; and therefore since we are so much indebted to God for accepting our best, it is not safe ventured to present Him with a dough-baked sacrifice[f], and put Him off with that which in nature and human consideration is absolutely the worst; for such is all the crude and imperfect utterance of our more imperfect conceptions. *Hoc non probo in philosopho, cujus oratio*[g], *sicut vita, debet esse composita,* said Seneca[h], 'a wise man's speech should be like his life and actions, composed, studied, and considered:' and if ever inconsideration be the cause of sin and vanity, it is in our words, and therefore is with greatest care to be avoided in our prayers, we being most of all concerned that God may have no quarrel against them for folly or impiety.

§ 9. But abstracting from the reason, let us consider who keeps the precept best, he that deliberates, or he that considers not when[i] he speaks? What man in the world is 'hasty to offer any thing unto God,' if he be not who prays *ex tempore?* And then add to it but the weight of Solomon's reason, and let any man answer me if he thinks it can well stand with that reverence we owe to the immense, the infinite, and to the eternal God, the God of wisdom, to offer Him a sacrifice which we durst not present to a prince or a prudent governor, *in re seria,* such as our prayers ought to be.

§ 10. And that this may not be dashed with a pretence it is

[c] [vid.] Isocrat. in Panathen. [p. 320.]
[d] ['wave,' C, D.]
[e] [Eccles. v. 2.]
[f] [Herod. Euterp. 47.—Plut. in Lucull., cap. x. tom. iii. p. 242.]
[g] [leg. 'pronuntiatio.']
[h] [vid. p. 256. not. b, supra.]
[i] ['not but when,' A.]

carnal reasoning, I desire it may be remembered that it is the argument God himself uses against lame, maimed, and imperfect sacrifices, 'Go and offer this to thy prince, see if he will accept it[j];' implying that the best person is to have the best present, and what the prince will slight as truly unworthy of him, much more is it unfit for God. For God accepts not of any thing we give or do as if He were bettered by it; for therefore its estimate is not taken by its relation or natural complacency to Him, for in itself it is to Him as nothing: but God accepts it by its proportion and commensuration to us. That which we call our best, and is truly so in human estimate, that pleases God, for it declares that if we had better we would give it Him; but to reserve the best, says too plainly that we think any thing is good enough for Him. As therefore God in the law would not be served by that which was imperfect *in genere naturæ*, so neither now nor ever will that please Him which is imperfect *in genere morum* or *materia intellectuali*, when we can give a better.

§ 11. And therefore the wisest nations and the most sober persons prepared their verses and prayers in set forms, with as much religion as they dressed their sacrifices, and observed the rites of festivals and burials. Amongst the Romans it belonged to the care of the priests to worship in prescribed and determined words; *In omni precatione qui vota effundit sacerdos Vestam et Janum aliosque deos præscriptis verbis et composito carmine advocare solet*[k]. The Greeks did so too, receiving their prayers by dictate, word for word; *Itaque sua carmina suæque precationes singulis diis institutæ sunt, quas plerumque, nequid præpostere dicatur, aliquis ex præscripto præire et ad verbum præferre solebat*[l], 'their hymns and prayers were ordained peculiar to every god, which, lest any thing should be said preposterously, were usually pronounced word for word after the priest, and out of written copies:' and the *Magi* among the Persians were as considerate in their devotions; *Magos et Persas primo semper diluculo canere diis hymnos et laudes, meditato et solenni precationis carmine*[m], 'the Persians sang hymns to their gods by the morning twilight, in a premeditate, solemn, and metrical[n] form of prayer,' saith the same author. For since in all the actions and discourses of men that which is the least considered is likely to be the worst, and is certainly of the greatest disreputation, it were a strange cheapness of opinion towards God and religion to be the most incurious of what we say to Him, and in our religious offices. It is strange that every thing should be considered but our prayers. It is spoken by Eunapius[o] to the honour of Proæresius's scholars that when the proconsul asked their judgments in a question of philosophy, they were προσενεγκόντες τὰ

[j] [Mal. i. 8.]

[k] Alex. ab Alex., lib. ii. c. 14. [tom. i. p. 373.]

[l] Idem., lib. iv. c. 17. [tom. i. p. 1100.]

[m] Ibid. [p. 1098.]

[n] ['Carmen' does not necessarily imply metre. See Scheller.—Liv. xxxix. 15, init.—Cic. pro Muræn. init.]

[o] [vid.] in vit. Proæresii. [tom. i. p. 82.]

'Αριστείδου μετὰ πολλῆς σκέψεως καὶ πόνου, ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶ τῶν ἐμούντων ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων, 'they with much consideration and care gave in answer those words of Aristides, that they were not of the number of those that used to vomit out answers, but of those that considered every word they were to speak.' *Nihil enim ordinatum est quod præcipitatur et properat*, said Seneca[p], 'nothing can be regular and orderly that is hasty and precipitate;' and therefore unless religion be the most imprudent, trifling, and inconsiderable thing, and that the work of the Lord is done well enough when it is done negligently, or that the sanctuary hath the greatest beauty when it hath the least order, it will concern us highly to think our prayers and religious offices are actions fit for wise men, and therefore to be done as the actions of wise men use to be, that is, deliberately, prudently, and with greatest consideration.

§ 12. Well then, in the nature of the thing *ex tempore* forms have much the worse of it.

But it is pretended that there is such a thing as the 'gift of prayer,' a 'praying with the Spirit;' *et nescit tarda molimina Spiritus sancti gratia*, God's spirit if He pleases can do His work as well in an instant as in long premeditation: and to this purpose are pretended those places of scripture which speak of the assistance of God's spirit in our prayers; "And I will pour upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication[q];" but especially Rom. viii. 26, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered," &c. From whence the conclusion that is inferred is, in the words of S. Paul, that we must "pray with the spirit," therefore not with set forms, therefore *ex tempore*.

§ 13. The collection is somewhat wild, for there is great independency in the several parts, and much more is in the conclusion than was virtually in the premises: but such as it is, the authors of it I suppose will own it; and therefore we will examine the main design of it, and then consider the particular means of its persuasion quoted in the objection.

§ 14. It is one of the privileges of the gospel and the benefits of Christ's ascension, that the Holy Ghost is given unto the church, and is become to us the fountain of gifts and graces. But these gifts and graces are improvements and helps of our natural faculties, of our art and industry, not extraordinary, miraculous, and immediate infusions of habits and gifts. That without God's spirit we cannot pray aright, that our infirmities need His help, that we know not what to ask of ourselves, is most true; and if ever any heretic was more confident of his own naturals, or did ever more undervalue God's grace, than the Pelagian did, yet he denies not this: but what then? therefore without study, without art, without premeditation,

[p] [vid. p. 256. not. b, supra.]

[q] [Zech. xii. 10.]

without learning, the Spirit gives the gift of prayer, and is it His grace that without any natural or artificial help makes us pray *ex tempore?* No such thing: the objection proves nothing of this.

§ 15. Here therefore we will join issue, whether the gifts and helps of the Spirit be immediate infusions of the faculties, and powers, and perfect abilities; or that He doth assist us only by His aids external and internal in the use of such means which God and nature hath given to man to ennoble his soul, better his faculties, and to improve his understanding? That the aids of the Holy Ghost are only assistances to us in the use of natural and artificial means, I will undertake to prove; and from thence it will evidently follow that labour, and hard study, and premeditation, will soonest purchase the gift of prayer, and ascertain us of the assistance of the Spirit; and therefore set forms of prayer, studied and considered of, are in a true and proper sense, and without enthusiasm, the fruits of the Spirit.

§ 16. First; God's spirit did assist the apostles by ways extraordinary, and fit for the first institution of christianity, but doth assist us now by the expresses of those first assistances which He gave to them immediately.

§ 17. Thus the Holy Ghost brought to their memory all things which Jesus spake and did, and by that means we come to know all that the Spirit knew to be necessary for us, the Holy Ghost being author of our knowledge by being the fountain of the revelation; and we are therefore θεοδίδακτοι, 'taught by God,' because the Spirit of God revealed the articles of our religion that they might be known to all ages of the church; and this is testified by St. Paul, "He gave some apostles, and some prophets," &c., "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man," &c. This was the effect of Christ's ascension, when He 'gave gifts unto men,' that is, when He sent the Spirit, the verification of the promise of the Father. The effect of this emission of the Holy Ghost was to fill all things, and that for ever; to build up the church of God until the day of consummation; so that the Holy Ghost abides with the church for ever, by transmitting those revelations which He taught the apostles to all Christians in succession. Now as the Holy Ghost taught the apostles, and by them still teaches us, what to believe; so it is certain He taught the apostles how and what to pray; and because it is certain that all the rules concerning our duty in prayer, and all those graces which we are to pray for, are transmitted to us by derivation from the apostles, whom the Holy Ghost did teach even to that very purpose also that they should teach us; it follows evidently that the gift of prayer is a gift of the Holy Ghost; and yet to verify this proposition we need no other immediate inspiration or extraordinary assistance than that we derive from the Holy Ghost by the conveyance of the apostolical sermons and writings.

§ 18. The reason is the same in Faith and Prayer; and if there were any difference in the acquisition or reception, faith certainly needs a more immediate infusion, as being of greatest necessity, and yet a grace to which we least co-operate, it being the first of graces, and less of the will in it than any other. But yet the Holy Ghost is the author of our faith, and 'we believe with the spirit' (it is S. Paul's expression) and yet our 'belief comes by hearing' and reading the holy scriptures and their interpretations. Now reconcile these two together, 'Faith comes by hearing[r],' and yet 'is the gift of the Spirit,' and it says that the gifts of the Spirit are not ecstasies and immediate infusions of habits, but helps from God, to enable us, upon the use of the means of His own appointment, to believe, to speak, to understand, to prophesy, and to pray.

§ 19. But whosoever shall look for any other gifts of the Spirit besides the parts of nature helped by industry and God's blessing upon it, and the revelations or the supplies of matter in holy scripture, will be very far to seek, having neither reason, promise, nor experience, of his side. For why should the spirit of prayer be any other than as the gift and 'spirit of faith,' as S. Paul calls it[s], acquired by human means, using divine aids? that is, by our endeavours in hearing, reading, catechizing, desires to obey, and all this blessed and promoted by God, this produces faith. Nay, it is true of us what Christ told His apostles, *sine me nihil postestis facere;* not *nihil magnum aut difficile,* but *omnino nihil,* as S. Austin[t] observes; 'without Me ye can do nothing;' and yet we were not capable of a law, or of reward or punishment, if neither with Him nor without Him we were able to do any thing. And therefore although in the midst of all our co-operation we may say to God, in the words of the prophet[u], *Domine, omnia opera operatus es in nobis,* 'O Lord, Thou hast wrought all our works in us,' yet they are *opera nostra* still; God works, and we work: first is the χάρις φερομένη, God's grace is brought to us, He helps and gives us abilities, and then expects our duty. And if the spirit of prayer be of greater consequence than all the works God hath wrought in us besides, and hath the promise of a special prerogative, let the first be proved, and the second be shewn in any good record, and then I will confess the difference.

§ 20. The parallel of this argument I the rather urge, because I find praying in the Holy Ghost joined with graces which are as much God's gifts and productions of the Spirit as any thing in the world, and yet which the apostle presses upon us as duties, and things put into our power, to be improved by our industry; and those are faith (in which I before instanced) and charity. "But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the

[r] [Ephes. ii. 8; (et Rom. x. 17;) 1 Cor. xii. 9.]
[s] [2 Cor. iv. 13.]
[t] [in loc., tom. iii. part. 2. col. 704 E.]
[u] [Esai. xxvi. 12.]

Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God[v]." All of the same consideration, faith, and prayer, and charity, all gifts of the Spirit, and yet 'build up yourselves in faith,' and 'keep yourselves in love,' and therefore, by a parity of reason, improve yourselves in the spirit of prayer; that is, God by His spirit having supplied us with matter, let our industry and co-operations *per modum naturæ*, improve these gifts, and build upon this foundation.

§ 21. Thus the Spirit of God is called the 'Spirit of adoption,' the 'Spirit of counsel,' the 'Spirit of grace,' the 'Spirit of meekness,' the 'Spirit of wisdom.' And without doubt He is the fountain of all these to us all, and that for ever, and yet it cannot reasonably be supposed but that we must stir up the graces of God in us, co-operate with His assistances, study in order to counsel, labour and consider in order to wisdom, give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, in order to our adoption in which we are sealed by the Spirit. Now these instances are of gifts as well as graces, and since the days of wonder and need of miracles is expired, there is no more reason to expect inspiration of gifts than of graces without our endeavours. It concerns the church rather to have these secured than those, and yet the Spirit of God puts it upon the condition of our co-operation; for according to the proverb of the old moralists, *Deus habet sinum facilem, non perforatum*, 'God's bosom is apt and easy' to the emission of graces and assistances, but it is 'not loose and ungirt;' something must be done on our part, we must improve the talents and swell the bank; for if either we lay them up in a napkin, or spend them, suppress the Spirit or extinguish it, we shall dearly account for it.

§ 22. In the mean time, if we may lose the gifts by our own fault, we may purchase them by our diligence; if we may lessen them by our[x] incuriousness, we may increase them by study; if we may quench the Spirit, then also we may re-enkindle it: all which are evident probation that the Holy Ghost gives us assistances to improve our natural powers, and to promote our acquisite, and His aids are not inspirations of the habit or infusions of a perfect gift, but a subliming of what God gave us in the stock of nature and art, to make it in a sufficient order to an end supernatural and divine.

§ 23. The same doctrine we are taught by S. Paul's[y] exhortation to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" and again, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands[z]." If there be any gifts of the Holy Ghost and spiritual influences dispensed without our co-operation and by inspiration of the entire power, it is in ordination; and the persons so ordained are most likely to receive the gift of prayer, if any such thing be for the edification of the church, they being the men ap-

[v] [Jude 20.]
[x] ['our' om. B.]
[y] [1 Tim. iv. 14.]
[z] [2 Tim. i. 6.]

pointed to intercede and to stand between God and the people; and yet this gift of God, even in those times when they were dispensed with miracle and assistances extraordinary, were given, as all things now are given, by the means also of our endeavour, and was capable of improvement by industry, and of defailance by neglect; and therefore much rather is it so now, in the days of ordinary ministration and common assistances.

§ 24. And indeed this argument, beside the efficacy of its persuasion, must needs conclude against the men to whom these *Adversaria* are addressed because themselves call upon their disciples to exercise the gift of prayer[a], and offer it to consideration that such exercising it is the way to better it; and if natural endowments and artificial endeavours are the way to purchase new degrees of it, it were not amiss they did consider a little before they begin, and did improve their first and smallest capacities before they ventured any thing in public by way of address to Almighty God. For the first beginnings are certainly as improvable as the next degrees, and it is certain they have more need of it, as being more imperfect and rude. Therefore whenever God's spirit hath given us any capacities or assistances, any documents, motions, desires, or any aids whatsoever, they are therefore given us with a purpose we should by our industry, skill, and labour, improve them, because without such co-operation the intention is made void and the work imperfect.

§ 25. And this is exactly the doctrine I plainly gather from the objected words of S. Paul, "the Spirit helpeth our infirmities;" *συναντιλαμβάνεται* it is in the Greek, *collaborantem adjuvat:* it is an ingeminate expression of our labours; and that supposes us to have faculties capable of improvement and an obligation to labour, and that the effect of having the gift of prayer depends upon the mutual concourse, that is, upon God blessing our powers and our endeavours. And if this way the Spirit performs His promise sufficiently, and does all that we need, and all that He ties Himself to; he that will multiply his hopes further than what is sufficient or what is promised, may possibly deceive himself, but never deceive God, and make Him multiply and continue miracles to justify his fancy.

§ 26. Better it is to follow the scriptures for our guide, as in all things else, so in this particular. "Take the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit[b]." 'The word of God' is 'the sword of the Spirit;' 'praying in the Spirit' is one way of using it, indeed the only way that he here specifies. 'Praying in the Spirit' then being the using of this word, and this sword being the word of God, it follows evidently that praying in the Spirit is praying in, or accord-

[a] "So, as that they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them: but, that each one, by meditation, by taking heed," &c., "may be careful to furnish his heart and tongue with further or other materials," &c.—Preface to the Directory, [p. 8. 4to. Lond. 1644.]

[b] [Ephes. vi. 17, 18.]

ing to, the word of God, that is, in the directions, rules, and expresses of the word of God, that is, of the holy scriptures. For we have many infirmities, and we need the Spirit to help; as doubting, coldness, weariness, disrelish of heavenly things, indifferency; and these are enough to interpret the place quoted in the objection, without tying Him to make words for us, to no great religious purposes, when God hath done that for us in other manner than what we dream of.

§ 27. So that in effect praying in the Holy Ghost, or with the Spirit, is nothing but prayer for such things, and in such manner, which God by His spirit hath taught us in holy scripture. Holy prayers, 'spiritual songs,' so the apostle[c] calls one part of prayer, viz., eucharistical or thanksgiving, that is, prayers or songs which are spiritual *in materia*. And if they be called spiritual for the efficient cause too, the Holy Ghost being the author of them, it comes all to one; for therefore He is the cause and giver of them, because He hath in His word revealed what things we are to pray for, and there also hath taught us the manner.

§ 28. And this I plainly prove from the words of S. Paul before quoted, "the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought[d]." In this we are infirm, that we know not our own needs, nor our own advantages: when the Holy Ghost hath taught us what to ask, and to ask that as we ought, then He hath healed our infirmities, and our ignorances in the matter and the manner; then we know what to pray for as we ought, then we have the grace of prayer and the spirit of supplication. And therefore in the instance before mentioned, concerning 'spiritual songs,' when the apostle had twice enjoined the use of them in order to prayer and preaching, to instruction and to eucharist, and those to be done by the aid of Christ and Christ's spirit: what in one place he calls 'being filled with the Spirit[e],' in the other he calls 'the dwelling of the word of Christ in us richly[f];' plainly intimating to us that when we are mighty in the scriptures, full of the word of Christ, then we are filled with the Spirit, because the Spirit is the great dictator of them to us, and the remembrancer; and when by such helps of scripture we sing hymns to God's honour and our mutual comfort, then we sing and give thanks in the Spirit: and this is evident if you consult the places and compare them.

§ 29. And that this is for this reason called a 'gift' and 'grace,' or issue of the Spirit, is so evident and notorious that the speaking of an ordinary revealed truth is called in scripture a 'speaking by the Spirit,' 1 Cor. xii. 8. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." For though the world could not acknowledge Jesus for the Lord without a revelation, yet now that we are taught this truth by scripture, and by the preaching of the apostles to which

[c] [Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.]
[d] [Rom. viii. 26.]
[e] [Eph. v. 18, 19.]
[f] [Col. iii. 16.]

they were enabled by the Holy Ghost[g], we need no revelation or enthusiasm to confess this truth, which we are taught in our creeds and catechisms; and this light sprang first from the emission of a ray from God's spirit, we must for ever acknowledge Him the fountain of our light. Though we cool our thirst at the mouth of the river, yet we owe for our draughts to the springs and fountains from whence the waters first came, though derived to us by the succession of a long current. If the Holy Ghost supplies us with materials and fundamentals for our building, it is then enough to denominate the whole edifice to be of Him, although the labour and the workmanship be ours upon another stock. And this is it which the apostle speaks[h], "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual." 'The Holy Ghost teaches,' yet it is upon our co-operation, our study and endeavour; while we 'compare spiritual things with spiritual,' the Holy Ghost is said to teach us, because these spirituals were of His suggestion and revelation:

§ 30. For it is a rule of the school, and there is much reason in it, *Habitus infusi infunduntur per modum acquisitorum*, 'whatsoever is infused into us is in the same manner infused as other things are acquired,' that is, step by step, by human means and co-operation; and grace does not give us new faculties and create another nature, but meliorates and improves our own. And therefore what the Greeks called ἕξεις, 'habits,' the Christians used to call δόσεις and δωρήματα, 'gifts,' because we derive assistances from above to heighten the habits, and facilitate the actions, in order to a more noble and supernatural end. And what S. Paul[i] said in the resurrection, is also true in this question, 'that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and then that which is spiritual.' The graces and gifts of the Spirit are postnate, and are additions to art and nature. God directs our counsels, opens our understandings, regulates our will, orders our affections, supplies us with objects, and arguments, and opportunities, and revelations *in scriptis*, and then most when we most employ our own endeavours, God loving to bless all the means and instruments of His service, whether they be natural or acquisite.

§ 31. So that now I demand whether, since the expiration of the age of miracles, God's spirit does not most assist us when we most endeavour and most use the means? He that says No, discourages all men from reading the scriptures, from industry, from meditation, from conference, from human arts and sciences, and from whatsoever else God and good laws provoke us to by proposition of rewards. But if Yea, as most certainly God will best crown the best endeavours, then the spirit of prayer is greatest in him who (supposing the like capacities and opportunities) studies hardest, reads most,

[g] [vid. Acts xix. 21, and xvi. 7—10.]
[h] [1 Cor. ii. 13.]
[i] [1 Cor. xv. 46.]

practises most religiously, deliberates most prudently; and then, by how much want of means is worse than the use of means, by so much *ex tempore* prayers are worse than deliberate and studied. Excellent therefore is the counsel of S. Peter[k], "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," not lightly then and inconsiderately; "if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth," great reason then to put all his abilities and faculties to it; and whether of the two does most likely do that, he that takes pains, and considers and discusses, and so approves and practises a form, or he that never considers what he says till he says it, needs not much deliberation to pass a sentence. Only methinks it is most unreasonable that we should be bound to prepare ourselves with due requisites to hear what they shall speak in public, and that they should not prepare what to speak, as if to speak were of easier or of less consideration than to hear what is spoken; or if they do prepare what to speak to the people, it were also very fit they prepared their prayers, and considered beforehand of the fitness of the offertory they present to God.

§ 32. Lastly, did not the penmen of the scripture write the epistles and gospels respectively all by the Spirit? Most certainly, "holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," saith S. Peter[l]: and certainly they were moved by a more immediate motion, and a motion nearer to an enthusiasm, than now-a-days in 'the gift and spirit of prayer;' and yet in the midst of those great assistances and motions[m] they did use study, art, industry, and human abilities. This is more than probable in the different styles of the several books, some being of admirable art, others lower and plain. The words were their own, at least sometimes, not the Holy Ghost's. And if Origen, S. Hierome, and especially the Greek fathers, scholiasts and grammarians, were not deceived by false copies, but that they truly did observe sometimes to be impropriety[n] of expression in the language, sometimes not true Greek, who will think those errors or imperfections in grammar were (in respect of the words I say precisely) immediate inspirations and dictates of the Holy Ghost, and not rather their own productions of industry and humanity? But clearly some of their words were the words of Aratus, some of Epimenides, some of Menander, some of S. Paul, "This speak I, not the Lord[o]." Some were the words of Moses, even all that part of the Levitical law which concerned divorces, and concerning which our blessed Saviour[p] affirms that 'Moses permitted it because of the hardness of their hearts, but from the beginning it was not so:' and

[k] [1 Pet. iv. 11.]

[l] [2 Pet. i. 21.]

[m] Etiam veteres prophetæ disposuerunt se ad respondendum prophetice, et vaticinia admoto plectro aut hausto calice dederunt.—Gen. xliv. 5. 'Scyphus quem furati estis ipse est in quo Dominus meus bibit, et in quo augurari solet,' dixit œconomus Josephi. Et 'efferte psalterium,' dixit Eliseus, 2 Reg. iii. 15. Dominum interrogaturus. Vid. Eras. Epist. ad Jo. Eckium, Ep. lib. 20. [al. ep. 376. tom. iii. part. 1. col. 397 sq.]

[n] ['propriety,' A.]

[o] [1 Cor. vii. 6.]

[p] [Matt. xix. 8.]

divers others of the same nature, collected and observed to this purpose, by Origen[q], S. Basil[r], S. Ambrose[s]: and particularly that promise which S. Paul made[t] of calling upon the Corinthians as he passed into Macedonia, which certainly in all reason is to be presumed to have been spoken *humanitus*, and not by immediate inspiration and infusion, because S. Paul was so hindered that he could not be as good as his word[u], and yet the Holy Ghost could have foreseen it, and might better have excused it, if S. Paul had laid it upon His score; but he did not, and it is reasonable enough to believe there was no cause he should; and yet because the Holy Ghost renewed their memory, improved their understanding, supplied to some their want of human learning, and so assisted them that they should not commit an error in fact or opinion, neither in the narrative nor dogmatical parts, therefore they writ 'by the Spirit.' Since then[x] we cannot pretend upon any grounds of probability to an inspiration so immediate as theirs, and yet their assistances which they had from the Spirit did not exclude human arts and industry, but that the ablest scholar did write the best, much rather is this true in the gifts and assistances we receive, and particularly in 'the gift of prayer;' it is not an *ex tempore* and an inspired faculty, but the faculties of nature and the abilities of art and industry are improved and ennobled by the supervening assistances of the Spirit. And if these who pray *ex tempore* say that the assistance they receive from the Spirit is the inspiration of words and powers without the operations of art and natural abilities and human industry, then besides that it is more than the penmen of scripture sometimes had (because they needed no extraordinary assistances to what they could of themselves do upon the stock of other abilities) besides this, I say, it must follow that such prayers so inspired, if they were committed to writing, would prove as good canonical scripture as any is in S. Paul's epistles; the impudence of which pretension is sufficient to prove the extreme vanity of the challenge.

§ 33. The sum is this: Whatsoever this 'gift' is, or this 'spirit of prayer,' it is to be acquired by human industry, by learning of the scriptures, by reading, by conference, and by whatsoever else faculties are improved and habits enlarged. God's spirit hath done His work sufficiently this way, and He loves not either in nature or grace, which are His two great sanctions, to multiply miracles when there is no need.

§ 34. And now let us take a man that pretends he hath the 'gift of prayer,' and loves to pray *ex tempore*, I suppose his thoughts go a little before his tongue; I demand then whether cannot this man,

[q] Homil. xvi. in Numer. [§ 4. tom. ii. p. 330.]
[r] Lib. v. contr. Eunom. c. penult. [§ 2. tom. i. p. 319 C, D.]
[s] Lib. viii. in Lucam, c. 16. [al. cap. 7 sq. tom. i. col. 1471 sq.]
[t] [1 Cor. xvi. 5.]
[u] [2 Cor. i. 15 sqq.]
[x] [sic A, B; 'that,' C, D.]

when it is once come into his head, hold his tongue and write down what he hath conceived? If his first conceptions were of God and God's spirit, then they are so still even when they are written. Or is the Spirit departed from him upon the sight of a pen and inkhorn? It did use to be otherwise among the old and new prophets, whether they were prophets of prediction or of ordinary ministry. But if his conception may be written, and being written is still a production of the Spirit, then it follows that 'set forms of prayer,' deliberate, and described, may as well be a praying with the spirit, as sudden forms and *ex tempore* outlets.

§ 35. Now the case being thus put, I would fain know what the difference is between deliberate and *ex tempore* prayers, save only that in these there is less consideration and prudence; for that the other are (at least as much as these) the productions of the Spirit, is evident in the very case put in this argument: and whether to consider and to weigh them be any disadvantage to our devotions, I leave it to all wise men to determine; so that in effect, since after the pretended assistance of the Spirit in our prayers, we may write them down, consider them, try the spirits, and ponder the matter, the reason and the religion of the address; let the world judge whether this sudden utterance and *ex tempore* forms be any thing else but a direct resolution not to consider beforehand what we speak. *Sic itaque habe, ut*[y] *istam vim dicendi rapidam aptiorem esse circulanti judices*[y] *quam agenti rem magnam et seriam, docentique:* they are the words of Seneca[z], and express what naturally flows from the premises. The pretence of the 'Spirit,' and the 'gift of prayer,' is not sufficient to justify the dishonour they do to religion, in serving it in the lowest and most indeliberate manner, nor quit such men from unreasonableness and folly who will dare to speak to God in the presence of the people, and in their behalf, without deliberation, or learning, or study. Nothing is a greater disreputation to the prudence of a discourse than to say it was a thing made up in haste, that is, without due considering.

§ 36. But here I consider, and I wish they whom it concerns most would do so too, that to pretend the Spirit in so unreasonable a manner, to so ill purposes, and without reason, or promise, or probability for doing it, is a very great crime, and of dangerous consequence. It was the greatest aggravation of the sin of Ananias and Sapphira ψεύσασθαι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, that they did falsely pretend and 'belie the Holy Spirit;' which crime besides that it dishonours the Holy Ghost, to make Him the president of imperfect and illiterate rites, the author of confusion and indeliberate discourses, and the parent of such productions which a wise person would blush to own; it also entitles Him to all those doctrines which either chance or design shall expose to the people in such prayers to which they entitle the Holy Spirit as the author and immediate dictator. So

[y] ['ut,' 'judices,' desunt.] [z] [Ep. xl. tom. ii. p. 138.]

that, if they please, He must not only own their follies but their impieties too; and how great disreputation this is to the Spirit of wisdom, of counsel, and of holiness, I wish they may rather understand by discourse than by experiment.

§ 37. But let us look a little further into the mystery, and see what is meant in scripture by 'praying with the Spirit.' In what sense the Holy Ghost is called the 'Spirit of prayer' I have already shewn; viz., by the same reason as He is the 'Spirit of faith,' 'of prudence,' 'of knowledge,' 'of understanding,' and the like, because He gives us assistances for the acquiring of these graces, and furnishes us with revelations by way of object and instruction. But 'praying with the Spirit' hath besides this other senses also in scripture. I find in one place that we then pray with the Spirit when the Holy Ghost does actually excite us to desires and earnest tendencies to the obtaining our holy purposes, when He prepares our hearts to pray, when He enkindles our desires, gives us zeal and devotion, charity and fervour, spiritual violence and holy importunity. This sense is also in the latter part of the objected words of S. Paul[a], "the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings;" and indeed this is truly a praying with the Spirit, but this will do our reverend brethren of the Assembly little advantage as to the present question, for this Spirit is not a spirit of utterance, not at all clamorous in the ears of the people, but cries aloud in the ears of God, with 'groans unutterable,' so it follows, and only "He that searcheth the heart," He "understandeth the meaning of the Spirit[b]." This is the Spirit of the Son, which 'God hath sent into our hearts,' (not into our tongues,) 'whereby we cry, Abba Father[c].' And this is the great *αὐθεντία* for mental prayer, which is properly and truly praying by the Spirit.

§ 38. Another praying with the Spirit I find in that place of S. Paul from whence this expression is taken, and commonly used, "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." It is generally supposed that S. Paul relates here to a special and extraordinary gift of prayer which was indulged to the primitive bishops and priests, the apostles and rulers of churches, and to some other persons extraordinarily, of being able to compose prayers, pious in the matter, prudent in the composure, devout in the forms, expressive in the language, and in short useful to the church and very apt for devotion, and serving to her religion and necessities. I believe that such a gift there was, and this indulged, as other issues of the Spirit, to some persons upon special necessities, by singular dispensation, as the Spirit knew to be most expedient for the present need and

[a] [Rom. viii. 26.]

[b] Suntne mei? suntne tui? imo sunt gemitus ecclesiæ, aliquando in me, aliquando in te. August.—Eodem modo quo S. August. dixit Deo, Conqueror tibi Domine, lachrymis Jesu Christi, de quo dictum est, Heb. v. 7, *δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσένεγκε.*

[c] [Gal. iv. 6.]

the future instruction. This I believe, not because I find sufficient testimony that it was so, or any evidence from the words now alleged, but because it was reasonable it should be so, and agreeable to the other proceedings of the Holy Ghost. For although we account it an easy matter to make prayers, and we have great reason to give thanks to the Holy Ghost for it who hath descended so plentifully upon the church, hath made plentiful revelation of all the public and private necessities of the world, hath taught us how to pray, given rules for the manner of address, taught us how to distinguish spiritual from carnal things, hath represented the vanity of worldly desires, the unsatisfyingness of earthly possessions, the blessing of being denied our impertinent, secular, and indiscreet requests, and hath done all this at the beginning of christianity, and hath actually stirred up the apostles and apostolical men to make so many excellent forms of prayer, which their successors did in part retain, and in part imitate, till the conjunct wisdom of the church saw her offices complete, regular, and sufficient. So that now every man is able to make something of forms of prayer (for which ability they should do well to pay their eucharist to the Holy Ghost, and not abuse the gift to vanity or schism); yet at the first beginning of christianity, till the Holy Spirit did fill all things, they found no such plenty of forms of prayer; and it was accounted a matter of so great consideration to make a form of prayer that it was thought a fit work for a prophet, or the founder of an institution. And therefore the disciples of John asked of him to 'teach them how to pray;' and the disciples of Christ[d] did so too. For the law of Moses had no rules to instruct the synagogue how to pray; and but that Moses, and David, and Asaph, and some few of the prophets more, left 'forms of prayer' which the Spirit of God inspired them withal, upon great necessities, and great mercy to that people, they had not known how to have composed an office for the daily service of the temple without danger of asking things needless, vain or impious; such as were the prayers in the Roman closets, that he was a good man that would not own them:

> Et nihil arcano qui roget ore Deos[e].
>
> ——— Pulchra Laverna
> Da mihi fallere, da justo, sanctoque videri;
> Noctem peccatis, et fraudibus objice nubem[f].

But when the Holy Ghost came down in a full breath and a mighty wind, He filled the breasts and tongues of men, and furnished the first Christians not only with abilities enough to frame excellent devotions for their present offices, but also to become precedents for liturgy to all ages of the church, the first being imitated by the second and the second by the third, till the church being settled in peace, and the records transmitted with greater care and preserved with less

[d] [Luke xi.] [e] [Mart. i. 40.] [f] [Hor. ep. i. 16. lin. 60.]

hazard, the church chose such forms whose copies we retain at this day.

§ 39. Now since it was certain that all ages of the church would look upon the first fathers in Christ and founders of churches as precedents, and tutors, and guides, in all the parts of their religion, and that Prayer with its several parts and instances is a great portion of the religion (the sacraments themselves being instruments of grace and effectual *in genere orationis*), it is very reasonable to think that the apostolical men had not only the first-fruits, but the elder brother's share, a double portion of the Spirit; because they were not only to serve their own needs, to which a single and an ordinary portion would have been then, as now, abundantly sufficient, but also to serve the necessity of the succession, and to instruct the church for ever after.

§ 40. But then that this assistance was an ability to pray *ex tempore* I find it no where affirmed by sufficient authentic testimony, and if they could have done it it is very likely they would have been wary and restrained in the public use of it. I doubt not but there might then be some sudden necessities of the church for which the church, being in her infancy, had not as yet provided any public forms; concerning which cases I may say, as Quintilian[g] of an orator in the great and sudden needs of the commonwealth, *Quarum si qua, non dico cuicumque innocentium civium, sed amicorum ac propinquorum alicui evenerit, stabitne mutus, et salutarem petentibus vocem, statim, si non succurratur, perituris, moras et secessum et silentium quæret, dum illa verba fabricentur, et memoriæ insidant, et vox ac latus præparetur?* I do not think that they were *oratores imparati ad casus*, but that an ability of praying on a sudden was indulged to them by a special aid of the Spirit, to contest against sudden dangers and the violence of new accidents; to which also possibly a new inspiration was but for a very little while necessary, even till they understood the mysteries of christianity and the revelations of the Spirit, by proportion and analogy to which they were sufficiently instructed to make their sudden prayers when sudden occasions did require.

§ 41. This I speak by way of concession and probability: for no man can prove thus much as I am willing (relying upon the reasonableness of the conjecture) to suppose; but that 'praying with the Spirit' in this place is praying without study, art, or deliberation, is not so much as intimated.

§ 42. For first, it is here implied that they did prepare some of those devotions to which they were helped by the Spirit: ὅταν συνέρχεσθε ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ψαλμὸν ἔχει, 'when you come together, each of you' peradventure 'hath a psalm:' ἔχει, not ποιεῖ, not every one 'makes,' but when you meet, every one 'hath,' viz., already, which supposes they had it prepared against the meeting. For the Spirit

[g] [Inst. or., lib. x. cap. 7.] De extemporali dicendi facultate. [tom. i. p. 950.]

could help as well at home in their meditation as in the public upon a sudden; and though it is certain the Holy Spirit loves to bless the public meetings, the communion of saints, with special benedictions, yet I suppose my adversaries are not willing to acknowledge any thing that should do much reputation to the church and the public authorized conventions, at least not to confine the Spirit to such holy and blessed meetings: they will I suppose rather grant the words do probably intimate, 'they came prepared with a hymn;' and therefore there is nothing in the nature of the thing but that so also might their other forms of prayer; the assistance of the Spirit (which is the thing in question) hinders not but that they also might have made them by premeditation.

§ 43. Secondly, in this place 'praying with the Spirit' signifies no other extraordinary assistance but that the Spirit helped them to speak their prayer in an unknown tongue: ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, τὸ πνεῦμα προσεύχεται, 'if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit:' what then? "I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also;" plainly here praying in the Spirit, which is opposed to praying in understanding, is praying in an unknown tongue. Where by the way observe, that praying with the Spirit, even in the sense of scripture, is not always most to edification of the people; not always 'with understanding:' and when these two are separated, S. Paul prefers five words with understanding before ten thousand in the spirit. For this praying with the Spirit was indeed then a gift extraordinary and miraculous, like as prophesying with the spirit, and expired with it; but while it did last, it was the lowest of gifts, *inter dona linguarum*, it was but a 'gift of the tongue,' and not to the benefit of the church directly or immediately.

§ 44. This also observe in passing by: if S. Paul did so undervalue the praying with the Spirit that he preferred edifying the church a thousand degrees beyond it, I suppose he would have been of the same mind if the question had been between praying with the Spirit and obeying our superiors, as he was when it was between praying with the Spirit and edification of the church; because, if I be not mistaken, it is matter of great concernment towards the edification of the church to obey our superiors, not to innovate in public forms of worship, especially with the scandal and offence of very wise and learned men, and to the disgrace of the dead martyrs who sealed our Liturgy with their blood.

§ 45. But to return. In this place praying with the Spirit, beside the assistance given by the Holy Ghost to speak in a strange tongue, is no more than "my spirit praying;" that is, it implies my cooperation with the assistance of the Spirit of God, insomuch that the whole action may truly be denominated mine, and is called 'of the spirit' only by reason of that collateral assistance. For so S. Paul joins them as terms identical, and expressive of one another's mean-

ing, as you may please to read 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, "I will pray with the spirit," and "my spirit truly prayeth;" it is the act of our inner man praying holy and spiritual prayers. But then indeed at that time there was something extraordinary adjoined, for it was in an unknown tongue, the practice of which S. Paul there dislikes. This also will be to none of their purposes; for whether it were *ex tempore* or by premeditation, is not here expressed; or if it had, yet that assistance extraordinary in prayer, if there was any beside the 'gift of tongues,' which is not here or any where else expressed, is no more transmitted to us than the speaking tongues in the spirit, or prophesying *ex tempore* and by the Spirit.

§ 46. But I would add also one experiment which S. Paul also there adds by way of instance. If 'praying with the Spirit' in this place be praying *ex tempore*, then so is singing too; for they are expressed in the same place, in the same manner, to the same end, and I know no reason why there should be differing senses put upon them to serve purposes. And now let us have some church music too, though the organs be pulled down; and let any the best psalmist of them all compose a hymn in metrical form (as Antipater Sidonius in Quintilian, and Licinius Archias in Cicero, could do in their verses) and sing it to a new tune with perfect and true music, and all this *ex tempore;* for all this the Holy Ghost can do if He pleases. But if it be said that the Corinthian Christians composed their songs and hymns according to art and rules of music, by study and industry, and that to this they were assisted by the Spirit, and that this together with the devotion of their spirit was singing with the spirit; then say I, so composing set forms of liturgy by skill and prudence and human industry may be as much praying with the Spirit as the other is singing with the Spirit; plainly enough. In all the senses of praying with the Spirit, and in all its acceptations in scripture, to pray or sing with the Spirit neither of them of necessity implies *ex tempore.*

§ 47. The sum or *collecta* of the premises is this: praying with the Spirit is, [1] either when the Spirit stirs up our desires to pray *per motionem actualis auxilii;* [2] or when the Spirit teaches us what or how to pray, telling us the matter and manner of our prayers; [3] or lastly, dictating the very words of our prayers: there is no other way in the world to 'pray with the Spirit' or 'in the Holy Ghost' that is pertinent to this question. And of this last manner the scripture determines nothing, nor speaks any thing expressly of it; and yet suppose it had, we are certain the Holy Ghost hath supplied us with all these, and yet in set forms of prayer best of all, I mean there where a difference can be; for,

[1] As for the desires and actual motions or incitements to pray, they are indifferent to one or the other, to set forms or to *ex tempore.*

§ 48. [2] But as to the matter or manner of prayer, it is clearly con-

tained in the express and set forms of scriptures, and there it is supplied to us by the Spirit, for He is the great dictator of it.

§ 49. [3] Now then for the very words. No man can assure me that the words of his *ex tempore* prayer are the words of the Holy Spirit. It is not reason nor modesty to expect such immediate assistances to so little purpose, He having supplied us with abilities more than enough to express our desires *aliunde*, otherwise than by immediate dictate. But if we will take David's psalter, or the other hymns of holy scripture, or any of the prayers which are respersed over the Bible, we are sure enough that they are the words of God's Spirit, mediately or immediately, by way of infusion or ecstacy, by vision, or at least by ordinary assistance. And now then what greater confidence can any man have for the excellency of his prayers and the probability of their being accepted, than when he prays his psalter, or the Lord's prayer, or any other office which he finds consigned in Scripture? When God's spirit stirs us up to an actual devotion, and then we use the matter He hath described and taught, and the very words which Christ and Christ's spirit, and the apostles and other persons full of the Holy Ghost, did use; if in the world there be any praying with the Spirit, I mean in vocal prayer, this is it.

§ 50. And thus I have examined the entire and full scope of this FIRST Question, and rifled their objection, which was the only colour to hide the appearance of its natural deformity at the first sight. The result is this, *Scribendum ergo quoties licebit, si id non dabitur cogitandum; ab utroque exclusi, debent tamen adniti ut neque deprehensus orator neque litigator destitutus esse videatur*[h], 'in making our orations and public advocations, we must write what we mean to speak, as often as we can; when we cannot, yet we must deliberate and study; and when the suddenness of the accident prevents both these, we must use all the powers of art and care, that we have a present mind, and call in all our first provisions, that we be not destitute of matter and words apt for the employment.' This was Quintilian's rule for the matter of prudence and in secular occasions; but when the instance is in religion, and especially in our prayers, it will concern us nearer to be curious and deliberate what we speak in the audience of the eternal God, when our lives and our souls, and the honour of God and the reputation of religion are concerned, and whatsoever is greatest in itself or dearest to us.

QUESTION II.

§ 51. THE SECOND Question hath in it something more of difficulty; for the men that own it will give leave that 'set forms' may be used, so you give leave to them to make them; but if authority shall interpose and prescribe a liturgy, every word shall breed a quarrel; and if the matter be innocent, yet the very injunction is tyranny, a re-

[h] Quintil. [Inst. or., lib. x. cap. 7. tom. i. p. 958.]

straining of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, it leaves the spirit of a man sterile and unprofitable, it is not for edification of the church, and is as destitute of comfort as it is of profit. For God hath not restrained His spirit to those few that rule the church in prelation above others, but if He hath given to them the spirit of government, He hath given to others the spirit of prayer and the spirit of prophecy. "Now the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal, for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word knowledge by the same Spirit[1];" and these and many other gifts are given to several members, that they may supply one another, and all join to the edification of the body; and therefore that must needs be an imprudent sanction that so determines the offices of the church that she cannot be edified by that variety of gifts which the Holy Spirit hath given to several men to that purpose; just as if there should be a canon that but one sermon should be preached in all churches for ever. Besides, it must needs be that the devotion of the suppliants must be much retarded by the perpetuity and unalterable reiteration of the same form; for since our affections will certainly vary and suffer great alteration of degrees and inclinations, it is easier to frame words apt to comply with our affections than to conform our affections in all varieties to the same words. When the forms are daily changed it is more probable that every man shall find something proportionable to his fancy, which is the great instrument of devotion, than to suppose that any one form should be like *Manna*, fitted to every taste; and therefore in prayers, as the affections must be natural, sweet, and proper, so also should the words expressing the affections issue forth by way of natural emanation. *Sed extemporalis audaciæ atque ipsius temeritatis vel præcipua jucunditas est; nam in ingenio quoque, sicut in agro, quanquam alia diu serantur atque elaborentur, gratiora tamen quæ sua sponte nascuntur*[1]. And a garment may as well be made to fit the moon, as that one form of prayer should be made apt and proportionable to all men, or to any man at all times.

§ 52. This discourse relies wholly upon these two grounds; first, a liberty to use variety of forms for prayer is more for the edification of the church: secondly, it is part of that liberty which the church hath, and part of the duty of the church to preserve the liberty of the Spirit in various forms.

§ 53. Before I descend to consideration of the particulars I must premise this, that the gift or ability of prayer given to the church is used either in public or in private, and that which is fit enough for one is inconvenient in the other; and although a liberty in private may be for edification of good people when it is piously and discreetly used, yet in the public if it were indifferently permitted it

[1] [1 Cor. xii. 7.]

[1] Quintil. [al. Corn. Tac.] Dial. de Oratorib., cap. vii. [al. vi. Tac. opp. tom. iv. p. 350.]

would bring infinite inconvenience, and become intolerable, as a sad experience doth too much verify.

§ 54. But now then this distinction evacuates all the former discourse, and since it is permitted that every man in private use what forms he please, the Spirit hath all that liberty that is necessary, and so much as can be convenient; the church may be edified by every man's gift, the affections of all men may be complied withal, words may be fitted to their fancies, their devotions quickened, their weariness helped and supported, and whatsoever benefit can[k] be fancied by variety and liberty, all that may be enjoyed, and every reasonable desire or weaker fancy be fully satisfied.

§ 55. But since these advantages to devotion are accidental, and do consult with weakness and infirmity, and depend upon irregular variety, for which no antecedent rule can make particular provision; it is not to be expected the public constitution and prescribed forms, which are regular, orderly, and determined, can make provision for particulars, for chances, and for infinite varieties. And if this were any objection against public forms, it would also conclude against all human laws, that they did not make provision for all particular accidents and circumstances that might possibly occur; all public sanctions must be of a public spirit and design, and secure all those excellent things which have influence upon societies, communities of men, and public obligations.

§ 56. Thus if public forms of prayer be described whose matter is pious and holy, whose design is of universal extent, and provisionary for all public, probable, feared, or foreseen events, whose frame and composure is prudent, and by authority competent and high, and whose use and exercise is instrumental to peace and public charity, and all these hallowed by intention and care of doing glory to God and advantages to religion, expressed in observation of all such rules and precedents as are most likely to teach us best and guide us surest, such as are scriptures, apostolical tradition, primitive practice, and precedents of saints and holy persons, the public can do no more; all the duty is performed, and all the care is taken.

§ 57. Now after all this there are personal necessities and private conveniences or inconveniences, which if men are not so wise as themselves to provide for by casting off all prejudice and endeavouring to grow strong in christianity, men in Christ, and not for ever to be babes in religion, but frame themselves to a capacity of receiving the benefit of the public, without needing other provisions than what will fit the church in her public capacity; the Spirit of God, and the church taught by Him, hath permitted us to comply with our own infirmities, while they are innocent, and to pray in private in any form of words which shall be most instrumental to our devotion in the present capacity. *Neque hoc ego ago ut ex tempore dicere malit, sed ut possit*[l].

[k] ['may,' C, D.]

[l] Quintil. [Inst. or., lib. x. cap. 7. tom. i. p. 950.]

§ 58. And indeed sometimes an exuberant and an active affection and overflowing of devotion may descend like anointing from above, and our cup run over, and is not to be contained within the margent of prescribed forms; and though this be not of so great consideration as if it should happen to a man in public, that it is then fit for him, or to be permitted, to express it in forms unlimited and undetermined, (for there was a case in the days of the inundation of the Spirit, when a man full of the Spirit was commanded to "keep silence in the church, and to speak to himself and to God[m];") yet when this grace is given him in private, he may compose his own liturgy; *pectus est enim quod disertos facit, et vis mentis; ideoque imperitis quoque, si modo sunt aliquo affectu concitati, verba non desunt*[n]. Only when in private devotion we use forms of our own making or choosing, we are concerned to see that the matter be pious, apt for edification and the present necessity, and without contempt of public prescriptions, or irreverence to God, and in all the rest we are at liberty[o]; 'only in the Lord,' that is, according to the rule of faith and the analogy of christian religion. For supposing that our devotion be fervent, our intention pious, and the petition καθ' ὃ δεῖ, 'according to the will of God,' whatsoever our expressions are, God reads the petition in the character of the Spirit, though the words be *brevia, concisa, et singultantium modo ejecta*. But then these accidental advantages and circumstances of profit which may be provided for in private, as they cannot be taken care of in public, so neither is it necessary they should; for those pleasures of sensible devotion are so far from being necessary to the acceptation of prayer, that they are but compliances with our infirmities, and suppose a great weakness in him that needs them, say the masters of spiritual life[p]; and in the strongest prayers and most effectual devotions, are seldomest found; such as was Moses' prayer when he spake nothing, and Hannah's, and our blessed Saviour's when He called upon His Father κραυγαῖς ἰσχυραῖς[q], 'with strong cries,' in that great desertion of spirit when He prayed in the garden; in these prayers the spirit was bound up with the strictness and violence of intention, but could not ease itself with a flood of language and various expression. A great devotion is like a great grief, not so expressive as a moderate passion; tears spend the grief, and variety of language breathes out the devotion; and therefore Christ went thrice, and said the same words; He could

[m] [1 Cor. xiv. 28.]

[n] Quintil. [ubi supra, p. 953.]

[o] Quale est illud apud Tertul. [Apol. cap. xxx. p. 27 B.] de privatis christianorum precibus, non quidem ab alio dictatis sed a scripturarum fontibus derivatis, 'Illuc suspicientes christiani, manibus expansis, quia innocuis; capite nudo, quia non erubescimus; denique sine monitore, quia de pectore, oramus pro omnibus imperatoribus, vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum, et quæcunque hominis et Cæsaris vota sunt.'

[p] [See 'Life of Christ,' part i. sect. 5. disc. iii. 'Of meditation,' §§ 14 to end.]

[q] [vid. Heb v. 7.]

just speak His sense in a plain expression, but the greatness of His agony was too big for the pleasure of a sweet and sensible expression of devotion.

§ 59. So that let the devotion be never so great, set forms of prayer will be expressive enough of any desire, though importunate as extremity itself; but when the spirit is weak, and the devotion imperfect, and the affections dry, though in respect of the precise duty on our part, and the acceptation on God's part, no advantage is got by a liberty of an indifferent, unlimited, and chosen form, and therefore in all cases the whole duty of prayer is secured by public forms; yet other circumstantial and accidental advantages may be obtained by it, and therefore let such persons feast themselves in private with sweetmeats and less nourishing delicacies; weak stomachs must be cared for; yet they must be confessed to have stronger stomachs and better health that can feed upon the wholesome food prepared in the common refectories.

§ 60. So that public forms, it is true, cannot be fitted to every man's fancy and affections, especially in an age wherein all public constitutions are protested against, but yet they may be fitted to all necessities, and to every man's duty; and for the pleasing the affections and fancies of men, that may be sometimes convenient, but it is never necessary; and God that suffers dryness of affections many times in His dearest servants and in their greatest troubles and most excellent devotions, hath by that sufferance of His given demonstration that it is not necessary such affections should be complied withal; for then He would never suffer those sterilities, but Himself by a cup of sensible devotion would water and refresh those drynesses; and if God himself does not, it is not to be expected the church should.

§ 61. And this also is the case of scripture, for the many discourses of excellent orators and preachers have all those advantages of meeting with the various affections and dispositions of the hearers, and may cause a tear when all S. Paul's epistles would not; and yet certainly there is no comparison between them but one chapter of S. Paul is more excellent, and of better use to the substantial part of religion, than all the sermons of S. Chrysostom; and yet there are some circumstances of advantage which human eloquence may have, which are not observed to be in those other more excellent emanations of the Holy Spirit. And therefore if the objection should be true, and that conceived forms of prayer in their great variety might do some accidental advantages to weaker persons and stronger fancies and more imperfect judgments, yet this instance of scripture is a demonstration that set and composed devotions may be better; and this reason does not prove the contrary, because the sermons in scripture are infinitely to be preferred before those discourses and orations which do more comply with the fancies of the people. Nay, we see by experience that the change of our prayers, or our books, or our company, is so delightful to most persons, that though the change

be for the worse[r], it more complies with their affections than the peremptory and unaltered retaining of the better; but yet this is no good argument to prove that change to be for the better.

§ 62. But yet if such compliance with fancies and affections were necessary, what are we the nearer if every minister were permitted to pray his own forms? how can his form comply with the great variety of affections which are amongst his auditors any more than the public forms described by authority? It may hit casually, and by accident be commensurate to the present fancy of some of his congregation with which at that time possibly the public form would not; this may be thus, and it may be otherwise, and at the same time in which some feel a gust and relish in his prayer, others might feel a greater sweetness in recitation of the public forms. This thing is so by chance, so irregular and uncertain, that no wise man, nor no providence less than divine, can make any provisions for it.

§ 63. And after all it is nothing but the fantastic and imaginative part that is pleased, which for aught appears may be disturbed with curiosity, peevishness, pride, spirit of novelty, lightness, and impertinency; and that to satisfy such spirits, and fantastic persons, may be as dangerous and useless to them as it is troublesome in itself. But then for the matter of edification, that is considerable upon another stock; for now-a-days, men are never edified unless they be pleased, and if they mislike the person or have taken up a quarrel against any form or institution, presently they cry out they are 'not edified,' that is, they are displeased; and the ground of their displeasures is nothing from the thing itself, but from themselves only: they are wanton with their meat, and long for variety, and then they cry out that *Manna* will not nourish them, but prefer the onions of Egypt before the food of angels. The way to cure this inconvenience is to alter the men, not to change the institution: for it is very certain that wholesome meat is of itself nutritive, if the body be disposed to its reception and entertainment; but it is not certain that what a sick man fancies out of the weakness of his spirit, the distemper of his appetite, and wildness of his fancy, that it will become to him either good, or good physic. Now in the entertainments of religion and spiritual repasts, that is wholesome, nutritive, and apt to edify, which is pious in itself, of advantage to the honour of God, whatsoever is good doctrine or good prayers, especially when it is prepared by a public hand, and designed for public use by all the wisdom of those men who in all reason are to be supposed to have received from God all those assistances which are effects of the spirit of government; and therefore it is but weakness of spirit, or strength of passion, impotency in some sense or other certainly, that first dislikes the public provision, and then says they are not wholesome.

§ 64. For I demand concerning the public liturgies of a church,

[r] [Μεταβολὴ πάντων γλυκύ.—Eurip. Orest. 234.]

of the Spirit she is likely to have; and then if there be no errors in the matter, the church hath the advantage and probability on her side; and if there be an error in matter in either of them, neither of them have the Spirit, or they make not the true use of it. But the public Spirit in all reason is to be trusted before the private, when there is a contestation, the church being *prior et potior in promissis*, she hath a greater and prior title to the Spirit. And why the church hath not the spirit of prayer in her compositions as well as any of her children, I desire once for all to be satisfied upon true grounds either of reason or revelation; and if she have, whether she have not as much as any single person; if she have but as much, then there is as much reason in respect of the Divine assistance that the church should make the forms, as that any single minister should, and more reason in respect of order and public influence, and care, and charge of souls; but if she have a greater portion of the Spirit than a single person, that is, if the whole be greater than the part or the public better than the private, then it is evident that the Spirit of the church in respect of the Divine assistance is chiefly, and in respect of order is only to be relied upon for public provisions and forms of prayer.

§ 70. But now if the church in her united capacity makes prayers for the people, they cannot be supposed to be other than limited and determined forms; for it is not practicable, or indeed imaginable, that a synod of church governors, be they who they will, so they be of Christ's appointment, should meet in every church and pray as every man list; their counsels are united, and their results are conclusions and final determinations, which like general propositions are applicable to particular instances; so that first, since the Spirit being the great dictator of holy prayers; and secondly, the Spirit is promised to the church in her united capacity; and thirdly, in proportion to the assembled, *cæteris paribus*, so are measures of the Spirit poured out; and fourthly, when the church is assembled, the prayers which they teach the people are limited and prescribed forms; it follows that limited and prescribed forms are in all reason emanations from the greatest portion of the Spirit, warranted by special promises, which are made to every man there present that does his duty as a private member of the christian church, and are due to him as a ruler of the church, and yet more especially and in a further degree to all them met together; where, if ever, the Holy Spirit gives such helps and graces which relate to the public government, and have influence upon the communities of Christians, that is, will bless their meeting, and give them such assistances as will enable them to do the work for which they convene.

§ 71. But yet if any man shall say, What need the church meet in public synods to make forms of prayer, when private ministers are able to do it in their several parishes? I answer, It is true many can, but they cannot do it better than a council; and I think no man is so impudent as to say he can do it so well; however, *Quod*

spectat ad omnes ab omnibus tractari debet, 'the matter is of public concernment, and therefore should be of public consultation,' and the advantages of publicly described forms I shall afterwards specify. In the mean time,

§ 72. (5) As the church, I mean the rulers of the church, are appointed presidents of religious rites, and as the rulers in conjunction are enabled to do it best by the advantages of special promises and double portions of the Spirit; so she always did practise this, either in conjunction or by single dictate, by public persons or united authority; but in all times as necessity required they prescribed set forms of prayer.

§ 73. If I should descend to minutes and particulars, I could instance, in the behalf of set forms, [1] that God prescribed to Moses a set form of prayer and benediction to be used when he did bless the people; [2] that Moses composed a song or hymn for the children of Israel to use to all their generations; [3] that David composed many for the service of the tabernacle, and every company of singers was tied to certain psalms, as the very titles intimate; and the psalms were such limited and determinate prescriptions, that in some God's spirit did bind them to the very number of the letters and order of the alphabet; [4] that Solomon and the holy kings of Judah brought them in and continued them in the ministration of the temple; [5] that in the reformation by Hezekiah the priests and Levites were commanded to praise the Lord 'in the words of David and Asaph[z];' [6] that 'all scripture is written for our learning,' and since all these and many more set forms of prayer are left there upon record, it is more than probable that they were left there for our use and devotion; and certainly it is as lawful and as prudent to pray scriptures, as to read scriptures; and it were well if we would use ourselves to the expression of scripture, and that the language of God were familiar to us, that we spake the words of Canaan, not the speech of Ashdod[a]; and time was when it was thought the greatest ornament of a spiritual person and instrument of a religious conversation; but then the consequents would be, that these prayers were the best forms which were in the words of scripture, and those psalms and prayers there recorded were the best devotions, but these are set forms; [7] to this purpose I could instance in the example of S. John the baptist, who taught his disciples a form of prayer; and that Christ's disciples begged the same favour, and it was granted as they desired it.

§ 74. And here I mean to fix a little, for this ground cannot fail us.

I say, Christ prescribed a set form of prayer to be used by all His disciples as a breviary of prayer, as a rule of their devotions, as a repository of their needs and as a direct address to God. For in this prayer God did not only command us to make our prayers as Moses

[z] [2 Chron. xxix. 30.] [a] [Neh. xiii. 24.]

was bid to make the tabernacle, 'after the pattern' which God shewed him in the mount, and Christ shewed His apostles[b]; but He hath given us the very tables written with His own hand, that we should use them as they are so delivered; this prayer was not only a precedent and pattern but an instance of address, a perfect form for our practice as well as imitation. For,

§ 75. (1) When Christ was upon the mount, He gave it for a pattern: οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς, 'so pray ye,' or 'after this manner;' which if we expound only to the sense of becoming a pattern or a directory, it is observable that it is not only directory for the matter but for the manner too: and if we must pray with that matter and in that manner, what does that differ from praying with that form? however, it is well enough that it becomes a precedent to us in any sense, and the church may vary her forms according as she judges best for edification.

§ 76. (2) When the apostles upon occasion of the form which the Baptist taught his disciples begged of their Master to teach them one, He again taught them this[c], and added a precept to use these very words; ὅταν προσεύχεσθε, λέγετε, 'when ye pray, say, Our Father;' ἔδει γὰρ μηδὲν ἴδιον αὐτοὺς λέγειν[d], when they spake to God, it was fit they should speak in His words in whose name also their prayers only could be acceptable.

§ 77. (3) For if we must speak this sense, why also are not the very words to be retained? is there any error or imperfection in the words? was not Christ master of His language, and were not His words sufficiently expressive of His sense? Will not the prayer do well also in our tongues which as a duty we are obliged to deposit in our hearts and preserve in our memories, without which it is in all senses useless, whether it be only a pattern, or a repository of matter?

§ 78. (4) And it is observable that our blessed Saviour doth not say, Pray that the name of your heavenly Father may be sanctified, or that your sins may be forgiven, but say, "Hallowed be Thy name," &c.; so that He prescribes this prayer, not in *massa materiæ* but in *forma verborum*, not 'in a confused heap of matter' but in 'an exact composure of words,' it makes it evident He intended it not only *pro regula petendorum*, 'for a direction of what things we are to ask,' but also *pro forma orationis*, 'for a set form of prayer.' Now it is considerable that no man ever had the fulness of the Spirit but only the holy Jesus, and therefore it is also certain that no man had the Spirit of prayer like to Him; and then if we pray this prayer devoutly and with pious and actual intention, do we not pray in the Spirit of Christ as much as if we prayed any other form of words pretended to be taught us by the Spirit? We are sure that Christ and Christ's spirit taught us this prayer; they only gather by

[b] [Matt. v. 1; vi. 9.]
[c] [Luke xi. 2.]
[d] Proæres. ap. Eunapium. [tom. i. p. 82.]

conjectures and opinions that in their *ex tempore* or 'conceived' forms the Spirit of Christ teacheth them. So much then as certainties are better than uncertainties and God's word better than man's, so much is this set form, besides the infinite advantages in the matter, better than their *ex tempore* and 'conceived' forms, in the form itself. And if ever any prayer was or could be a part of that 'doctrine of faith' by which 'we received the Spirit[e],' it must needs be this prayer, which was the only form our blessed Master taught the christian church immediately,—was a part of His great and glorious sermon in the mount,—in which all the needs of the world are sealed up as in a treasure-house, and intimated by several petitions as diseases are by their proper and proportioned remedies,—and which Christ published as the first emanation of His spirit, the first perfume of that heavenly anointing which descended on His sacred head when He went down into the waters of baptism.

§ 79. This we are certain of, that there is nothing wanting, nothing superfluous and impertinent, nothing carnal or imperfect in this prayer; but as it supplies all needs, so it serves all persons, is fitted for all estates, it meets with all accidents, and no necessity can surprise any man but if God hears him praying that prayer he is provided for in that necessity: and yet if any single person paraphrases it, it is not certain but the whole sense of a petition may be altered by the intervention of one improper word, and there can be no security given against this but qualified and limited, and just in such a proportion as we can be assured of the wisdom and honesty of the person and the actual assistance of the Holy Spirit.

§ 80. Now then I demand, whether the prayer of Manasses be so good a prayer as the Lord's prayer? or is the prayer of Judith, or of Tobias, or of Judas Maccabeus, or of the son of Sirach, is any of these so good? Certainly no man will say they are, and the reason is because we are not sure they are inspired by the Holy Spirit of God; prudent, and pious, and conformable to religion they may be, but not penned by so excellent a spirit as this prayer. And what assurance can be given that any minister's prayer is better than the prayers of the son of Sirach, who was a very wise and a very good man, as all the world acknowledges; I know not any one of them that has so large a testimony, or is of so great reputation. But suppose they can make as good prayers, yet surely they are apocryphal at least, and for the same reason that the apocryphal prayers are not so excellent as the Lord's prayer, by the same reason must the best they can be imagined to compose fall short of this excellent pattern, by how much they partake of a smaller portion of the Spirit, as a drop of water is less than all the waters under or above the firmament.

§ 81. Secondly, I would also willingly know whether if any man

[e] [Gal. iii. 2.]

uses the form which Christ taught, supposing He did not tie us to the very prescript words, can there be any hurt in it? Is it imaginable that any commandment should be broken, or any affront done to the honour of God, or any act of imprudence or irreligion in it, or any negligence of any insinuation of the divine pleasure? I cannot yet think of any thing to frame for answer, so much as by way of an antinomy or objection. But then supposing Christ did tie us to use this prayer, *pro loco et tempore* (according to the nature and obligation of all affirmative precepts) as it is certain He did, in the preceptive words recorded by S. Luke, "When ye pray, say, Our Father," then it is to be considered that a divine commandment is broken by its rejection; and therefore if there were any doubt remaining whether it be a command or no, yet since on one side there is danger of a negligence and a contempt, and that on the other side the observation and conformity cannot be criminal or imprudent; it will follow that the retaining of this prayer in practice, and suffering it to do all its intentions, and particularly becoming the great *αὐθεντία* or authority for set forms of prayer, is the safest, most prudent, most christian understanding of those words of Christ propounding the Lord's prayer to the christian church. And because it is impossible that all particulars should be expressed in any form of prayer, because particulars are not only casual and accidental but also infinite; Christ, according to that wisdom He had without measure, framed a prayer which by a general comprehension should include all particulars, eminently[f] and virtually, so that there should be no defect in it, and yet so short that the most imperfect memories might retain and use it.

§ 82. And it is not amiss to observe that our blessed Saviour first taught this prayer to be as a remedy and a reproof of the vain repetition of the pharisees; and besides that it was so *a priori*, we also in the event see the excellent spirit and wisdom in the constitution, for those persons who have laid aside the Lord's prayer have been noted by common observation to be very long in their forms, and troublesome and vain enough in their repetitions; they have laid aside the medicine, and the old wound bleeds afresh; the pharisees did so of old.

§ 83. And after all this, it is strange employment that any man should be put to justify the wisdom and prudence of any of Christ's institutions; as if any of His servants, who are wise upon His stock, instructed by His wisdom, made knowing by His revelations, and whose all that is good is but a weak ray of the glorious light of the Sun of righteousness, should dare to think that the derivative should be before the primitive, the current above the fountain; and that we should derive all our excellency from Him, and yet have some beyond Him, that is, some which He never had, or which He was not pleased to manifest; or that we should have a spirit of prayer able to make productions beyond His prayer who received the Spirit without measure. But this is not the first time man hath disputed against God.

[f] ['eminent,' B, C.]

§ 84. And now let us consider with sobriety, not only of this excellent prayer, but of all that are deposited in the primitive records of our religion. Are not those prayers and hymns in holy scripture excellent compositions, admirable instruments of devotion, full of piety, rare and incomparable addresses to God? Dare any man with his 'gift of prayer' pretend that he can *ex tempore* or by study make better? Who dares pretend that he hath a better spirit than David had, or than the apostles and prophets and other holy persons in scripture whose prayers and psalms are by God's spirit consigned to the use of the church for ever? Or will it be denied but that they also are excellent directories and patterns for prayer? and if patterns, the nearer we draw to our example are not the imitations and representments the better? And what then, if we took the samplers themselves? is there any imperfection in them, and can we mend them, and correct the *Magnificat?* The very matter of these, and the Author, no less than divine, cannot but justify the forms, though set, determined and prescribed.

§ 85. In a just proportion and commensuration I argue so concerning the primitive and ancient forms of church-service which are composed according to those so excellent patterns, which if they had remained pure as in the first institution, or had always been as they had[g] been reformed by the church of England, they would against all defiance put in for the next place to those forms of liturgy which *mutatis mutandis* are nothing but the words of scripture. But I am resolved at this present not to enter into question concerning the matter of prayers.

§ 86. Next we must enquire what the apostles did in obedience to the precept of Christ, and what the church did in imitation of the apostles. That the apostles did use the prayer their Lord taught them I think need not much be questioned; they could have no other end of their desire, and it had been a strange boldness to ask for a form which they intended not to use, or a strange levity not to do what they intended. But I consider they had a double capacity, they were of the Jewish religion by education, and now Christians by a new institution. In the first capacity they used those set forms of prayer which their nation used in their devotions: Christ and His apostles sang a hymn, part of the great *Allelujah*[h], which was usually sung at the end of the paschal supper; "after the supper they sang a hymn," says the evangelist[i]; the Jews also used every sabbath to sing the ninety-second psalm, which is therefore entitled, 'A song or psalm for the sabbath;' and they who observed the hours of prayer, and vows, according to the rites of the temple, need not be suspected to have omitted the Jewish forms of prayer. And as they complied with the religious customs of the nation, worshipping

[g] ['have,' B.]
[h] Vid. Scalig. de emend. tempor. de Judæor. magn. Allelujah. [lib. vi. p. 573.]
[i] [Matt. xxvi. 30.]

according to the Jewish manner, it is also in reason to be presumed they were worshippers according to the new christian institution, and used that form their Lord taught them.

§ 87. Now that they tied themselves to recitation of the very words of Christ's prayer *pro loco et tempore* I am therefore easy to believe, because I find they were strict to a scruple in retaining the sacramental words which Christ spake when He instituted the blessed sacrament, insomuch that not only three evangelists, but S. Paul also, not only making a narrative of the institution but teaching the Corinthians the manner of its celebration, to a tittle he recites the words of Christ. Now the action of the consecrator is not a theatrical representment of the action of Christ, but a sacred, solemn, and sacramental prayer[j], in which since the apostles at first, and the church ever after, did with reverence and fear retain the very words, it is not only a probation of the question in general in behalf of set forms, but also a high probability that they retained the Lord's prayer and used it to an *ἴσον*, in the very form of words.

§ 88. And I the rather make this inference from the preceding argument because of [k] the cognation one hath with the other; for the apostles did also in the consecration of the eucharist use the Lord's prayer, and that together with the words of institution was the only form of consecration, saith S. Gregory[l]; and S. Hierome[m] affirms that the apostles by the command of their Lord used this prayer[n] in the benediction of the elements.

§ 89. But besides this, when the apostles had received great measures of the Spirit, and by their gift of prayer composed more forms for the help and comfort of the church, and contrary to the order in the first creation, the light which was in the body of the sun was now diffused over the face of the new heavens and the new earth; it became a precept evangelical that we should praise God 'in hymns and psalms and spiritual songs[o],' which is so certain that they were compositions of industry and deliberation, and yet were sung in the Spirit, that he who denies the last speaks against scriptures, he who denies the first speaks against reason, and would best

[j] Imo totus canon consecrationis tam similis est et fere idem in verbis apud Græcos, Latinos, Arabas, Armenios, Syros, Ægyptios, Æthiopas, ut nisi a communi fonte, qui nisi apostolorum non est, manare non potuerit. 'Unde intelligi datur (quia multum erat ut in epistola totum illum agendi ordinem insinuaret quem universa per orbem servat ecclesia) ab ipso ordinatum esse quod nulla morum diversitate variatur.'—S. Aug. ep. cxviii. [al. liv. cap. 6. tom. ii. col. 127 B.]

[k] ['of' om. B, C.]

[l] Greg., lib. vii. ep. 63. [tom. ii. p. 940 D.]

[m] Hier., lib. contr. Pelag. [vid. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 543.]

[n] Eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis vel pene omnis frequentat ecclesia, ut 'precationes' accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud quod est in Domini mensa incipiat benedici; 'orationes,' cum benedicitur .. et ad distribuendum comminuitur: quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia dominica oratione concludit. S. Aug. ep. lix. q. 5. [al. ep. cxlix. § 16. tom. ii. col. 509 C.] ad illud Pauli, 'obsecro primum omnium fieri obsecrationes.'

[o] [Col. iii. 16.]

confute himself if in the highest of his pretence of the Spirit he would venture at some *ex tempore* hymns. And of this we have the express testimony of S. Austin[p], *de hymnis et psalmis canendis haberi Domini et apostolorum documenta et utilia præcepta.* And the church obeyed them; for as an ancient author under the name of Dionysius Areopagita[q] relates, the chief of the clerical and ministering order offer bread upon the altar, *Cum ecclesiastici omnes laudem hymnumque generalem Deo tribuerunt, cum quibus pontifex sacras preces rite perficit, &c.;* 'they all sing one hymn to God, and the bishop prays *rite*, according to the ritual or constitution,' which in no sense of the church, or of grammar, can be understood without a solemn and determined form; ὑμνεῖν, says Casaubon[r], is *cantare, idem sæpius dicere, apud Græcos* παλιλλογία· they were forms of praising God, used constantly, periodically, and in the daily offices. And the fathers of the council of Antioch[s] complain against Paulus Samosatenus, *quod psalmos et cantus qui ad Domini nostri Jesu Christi honorem decantari solent tanquam recentiores et a viris recentioris memoriæ editos exploserit;* the quarrel was 'that he said the church had used to say hymns which were made by new men, and not derived from the ancients;' which, if we consider that the council of Antioch was in the twelfth year of Gallienus the emperor, a hundred and thirty-three years after Christ's ascension, will fairly prove that the use of prescribed forms of prayer, hymns, and forms of worshipping, were very early in the church; and it is unimaginable it should be otherwise, when we remember the apostolical precept before mentioned. And if we fancy a higher precedent than what was manifested upon earth, we may please to see one observed to have been made in heaven; for a set form of worship and address to God, was recorded by S. John[t], and sung in heaven; and it was composed out of the songs of Moses[u], of David[v], and of Jeremy[w], which certainly is a very good precedent for us to imitate, although but revealed by S. John by way of vision and ecstasy, that we may see if we would speak with the tongue of men and angels we could not praise God in better forms than what are recorded in holy scripture.

§ 90. But besides the metrical part, the apostle hath described other parts of liturgy in scripture, whose composition, though it be in determined forms of words, yet not so bound up with numbers, as hymns: and these S. Paul[x] calls 'supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks,' which are several manners of address distinguished by their subject matter, by their form and manner of

[p] [vid.] Epist. cxix. [al. lv.] cap. 18. [tom. ii. col. 142 A.]

[q] [De hier. eccles., cap. iii. p. 88.]

[r] In Theophrast. charact. [περὶ εἰρων. p. 108. 8vo. Lugd. 1638. sed leg. 'idem ac s.']

[s] Ap. Euseb. [vid. interpr. Ruffin.] lib. vii. cap. 24. [p. 175.] et Walafrid. Strab. de Reb. eccles., cap. 25. [in Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. ix. part. i. p. 962.]

[t] [Apoc. xv. 3.]

[u] [Exod. xv.]

[v] [Psalm cxlv.]

[w] [chap. x. 6, 7.]

[x] [1 Tim. ii. 1.]

address. As appears plainly by 'intercessions and giving of thanks;' the other are also by all men distinguished, though in the particular assignment they differ; but the distinction of the words implies the distinction of offices, which together with the τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν προφήτων[x], the *Lectionarium* of the church, the books of the apostles and prophets spoken of by Justin Martyr and said to be used in the christian congregations, are the constituent parts of liturgy; and the exposition of the words we best learn from the practice of the church, who in all ages of whose public offices any record is left to us took their pattern from these places of scripture, the one for prose, the other for verse; and if we take liturgy into its several parts or members, we cannot want something to apply to every one of the words of S. Paul in these present allegations[y].

§ 91. For the offices of prose, we find but small mention of them in the very first time, save only in general terms, and that such there were, and that S. James, S. Mark, S. Peter, and others of the apostles and apostolical men, made liturgies[z]; and if these which we have at this day were not theirs, yet they make probation that these apostles left others, or else they were impudent people that prefixed their names so early, and the churches were very incurious to swallow such a bole, if no pretension could have been reasonably made for their justification. But concerning church hymns, we have clearer testimony in particular, both because they were many of them, and because they were dispersed more, soon got by heart, passed also among the people, and were pious arts of the Spirit whereby holy things were instilled into their souls by the help of fancy and a more easy memory. The first civilizing of people used to be by poetry, and their divinity was conveyed by songs and verses; and the apostle exhorted the Christians to 'exhort one another in psalms and hymns[a],' for he knew the excellent advantages were likely to accrue to religion by such an insinuation of the mysteries. Thus S. Hilary[b] and S. Ambrose[c] composed hymns for the use of the church, and S. Austin[d] made a hymn against the schism of Donatus; which hymns when they were publicly allowed of were used in public offices, not till then; for Paulus Samosatenus had brought women into the church to sing vain and trifling songs, and some bishops took to themselves too great and incurious a license, and brought hymns into the church whose gravity and piety was not very remarkable; upon occasion of which, the fathers of the council of Laodicea[e] ordained, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ

[x] [τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν, B.]

[y] Δέησις, παράκλησις, ἢ χρεία. Ἔντευξις, ἀπάντησις κατὰ τῶν πλημμελησάντων· δέησις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν. Εὔχεσθαι, ἱκετεύειν, καυχᾶσθαι, αὔχειν, λέγειν. Ἱκετήσιος ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱκετῶν Ζεύς, ἢ ὁ τοὺς ἱκέτας [οἰκέτας ed.] ἐλεῶν.—Hesych. [ad vocc.] Vide S. August. ep. lix. q. 5. in hunc locum; descripsi verba ad sect. 88. [vid. p. 292. not. n, supra.]

[z] [See Palmer, Origines liturgicæ.]

[a] Ut quisque de scripturis sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere.—Tertul. Apolog. [cap. xxxix. p. 32 B.]

[b] [col. 1213.]

[c] [tom. ii. col. 1219.]

[d] [tom. ix. col. 1.]

[e] [can. lix. tom. i. col. 791.]

ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, 'no psalms of private composition must be brought into the church,' so Gentian Hervet[f] renders it; Isidore[g] translates it *psalmos ab idiotis compositos*, 'psalms made by common persons;' 'psalms usually sung abroad,' so Dionysius Exiguus[g] calls them, *psalmos plebeios;* but I suppose by the following words is meant that none but scripture psalms shall be read there, for so the canon adds, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης, 'nothing to be read in the church but books of the Old and New testament.' And this interpretation agrees well enough with the occasion of the canon which I now mentioned.

§ 92. This only by the way, the reddition of ψαλμοὺς ἰδιωτικοὺς by Isidore to be 'psalms made by common persons,' whom the scripture calls ἰδιώτας, 'ignorant or unlearned,' is agreeable enough with that of S. Paul, who intimates that prayers and forms of liturgies are to be composed for them, not by them; they were never thought of to be persons competent to make forms of prayers themselves: for S. Paul[h] speaks of such an one as of a person coming into the church to hear the prophets pray, and sing, and interpret, and prophesy, and ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων, 'he is reproved of all, and judged of all;' and therefore the most unfit person in the world to bring any thing that requires great ability and great authority, to obtrude it upon the church, his rulers and his judges. And this was not unhandsomely intimated by the word sometimes used by the Εὐχολόγιον of the Greek church, calling the public liturgy κοντάκιον, which signifies prayers made for the use of the *idiotæ* or 'private persons,' as the word is contradistinguished from the rulers of the church. Κοντὸς signifies *contum*, and κοντῷ πλεῖν is as much as προσηκόντως ζῆν, 'to live in the condition of a private person,' and in the vulgar Greek, says Arcudius[i], κοντὸς and κονταρηνὸς ἄνθρωπος signify 'a little man, of a low stature,' from which two significations κοντάκιον may well enough design 'a short form of prayer, made for the use of private persons.' And this was reasonable, and part of the religion even of the heathen as well as Christians; the presidents of their religion were to find prayers for the people, and teach them forms of address to their gods.

> Castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti
> Disceret unde preces, vatem ni Musa dedisset?
> Poscit opem chorus, et præsentia numina sentit;
> Cœlestes implorat aquas docta prece blandus;
> . . . . . .
> Carmine Di superi placantur, carmine Manes[k]

[f] [Apud Mansi, Concil., tom. ii. col. 573; 'privatos et vulgares . . psalmos.']

[g] [Ut in not. e, supra.]

[h] [1 Cor. xiv. 23 sq.]

[i] [De concordia eccles. occident. et orient., lib. vi. (p. 435, fol. Par. 1626.) 'In lingua pura et casta Græcorum κοντὸς significat contum, unde proverbium κοντῷ πλεῖν, conto navigare, accipitur pro eo quod est, προσηκόντως ζῆν, decenter, ac pro tenui conditione vivere. In lingua vero vernacula κοντὸς et κονταρηνὸς ἄνθρωπος, curtum et parvæ staturæ hominem significat.']

[k] Hor. [ep. ii. 1. lin. 132.]

But this was by the way.

§ 93. But because I am casually fallen upon mention of the Laodicean council, and that it was very ancient, before the Nicene[l], and of very great reputation both in the east and in the west, it will not be a contemptible addition to the reputation of set forms of liturgy that we find them so early in the church reduced to a very regular and composed manner. The fifteenth canon[m] suffers none to sing in the church but the ἀπὸ διφθέρας ψάλλοντες καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀμβῶνα ἀναβαίνοντες, 'they that sing by book and go up into the pulpit;' they were the same persons, and the manner of doing their office was their appellative, which shews plainly that the known custom of the church was for them who were in the ἀμβὼν, in the 'pulpit,' to read their offices and devotions. They read them ἀπὸ διφθέρας, that's the word in the canon. Those things which signify the greatest or first antiquity, are said to be ἐν διφθέρᾳ γραφόμενα. Ἀρχαιότερα διφθέρας λαλεῖς[n], was spoken proverbially to signify 'ancient things:' and

—— Ζεὺς κατεῖδε χρόνιος εἰς τὰς διφθέρας[o]

so that if these fathers chose these words as grammarians, the singers ἀπὸ διφθέρας were such as sung ancient hymns of primitive antiquity; which also is the more credible because the persons were noted and distinguished by their employment, as a thing known by so long an use, till it came to be their appellative. The seventeenth and eighteenth canons command that lessons and psalms should be said interchangeably, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν εὐχῶν πάντοτε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑννάταις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις ὀφείλειν γίνεσθαι, 'and the same liturgy,' that's the word, 'or office of prayers, to be said always at nones and vespers.' This shews the manner of executing their office of psalmists and readers; they did not sing or say *ex tempore*, but they read prayers and psalms, and sung them out of a book; neither were they brought in fresh and new at every meeting, but it was αὐτὴ λειτουργία πάντοτε, 'still the same form of prayers,' without variation.

§ 94. But then if we remember how ancient this office was in the church, and that the ἀναγνῶσται and ψάλται, 'the readers and singers,' were clerical offices deputed for public ministry about prayers and devotions in the church (for so we are told by Simeon Thessalonicensis[p] in particular concerning the ἀναγνώστης,—Καὶ τοὺς θείους προλέγει τοῖς ψάλλουσιν ὕμνους, ἤτοι κανοναρχεῖ, 'he does dictate the hymns to the singers,' and then of the singers there is no question) and that these two offices were so ancient in the church that

[l] [So Baronius, and Binius, but wrongly, says Cosin on the Canon of Scripture, cap. lix.]

[m] [tom. i. col. 783.]

[n] [Gaisf. Parœmiogr. D iii. 2.]

[o] [Ibid., B 460. Z iv. 11.]

[p] [De sacram. ord. cap. 2, apud Morin. de Sacris eccles. ordin., p. 131 E. fol. Par. 1655.]

they were mentioned by S. Ignatius[q], who was contemporary with the latter times of the apostles; we may well believe that set and described forms of liturgy were as early as the days of the apostles, and continued in the continuation of those and the like offices in all descending ages. Of the same design and intimation were those known offices in the Greek church of the κανονάρχης, and the ὑποβολεὺς, which Socrates speaks of as of an office in the church of Alexandria, ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀναγνῶσται καὶ ὑποβολεῖς διάφοροι, εἴτε κατηχούμενοί εἰσιν εἴτε πιστοὶ, κ.τ.λ. Their office was the same with the reader; they did *ex præscripto præire et ad verbum referre;* the same which *ab Alexandro*[r] notes to have been done in the religious rites of heathen Greece, the first read out of a book the appointed prayers, and the others rehearsed them after. Now it is unimaginable that constant officers should be appointed to say an office, and no public office be described.

§ 95. I shall add but this one thing more, and pass on *ad alia;* and that is, that I never yet saw any instance, example, or pretence of precedent of any bishop, priest, or lay-person, that ever prayed *ex tempore* in the church; and although in some places single bishops, or peradventure other persons of less authority, did oftentimes bring prayers of their own[s] into the church; yet ever they were compositions, and premeditations, and were brought thither, there to be repeated often, and added to the liturgy; and although the liturgies while they were less full than since they have been were apt to receive the additions of pious and excellent persons, yet the inconvenience grew so great by permitting any forms but what were approved by a public spirit, that the church, as she always had forms of public prescription, so she resolved to permit no mixture of any thing but what was warranted by an equal power, that the spirit of the prophets might be subject to the prophets, and such spirits when they are once tried whether they be of God or no, tried by a lawful superior and a competent judge, may then venture into the open air. And it were a strange imprudence choosingly to entertain those inconveniences which our wiser forefathers felt, and declared, and remedied; for why should we be in love with that evil against which they so carefully armed their churches by the provision and defence of laws? For this produced that canon of the council of Milevis in Africa[t], *Placuit .. ut preces quæ probatæ fuerint in concilio .. ab omnibus celebrentur, nec aliæ omnino dicantur in ecclesia nisi quæ a prudentioribus factæ fuerint in synodo*[u]. That's the restraint and prohibition, "public prayers must be such as are publicly appointed and prescribed by our

[q] Epist. [supposit.] ad Antiochen. [§ 12. p. 107.] Memorantur etiam in xxxv. [al. xliii.] canone apostolorum. [p. 448.]

[r] [Dies gen., lib. iv. cap. 17. tom. i. p. 1100.]

[s] 'De proprio ingenio,' 'de pectore sine monitore,' we find once in Tertullian. [But see the places, Apol., capp. xxxix. and xxx. pp. 32 B, 27 B. See pp. 294, note a, and 281, note n, above.]

[t] [can. xii. tom. i. col. 1219.]

[u] [leg. 'a prudentioribus tractatæ, vel comprobatæ in synodo fuerint.']

superiors, and no private forms of our conceiving must be used in the church;" the reason follows, *ne forte aliquid contra fidem vel per ignorantiam vel per minus studium sit compositum,* 'lest through ignorance or want of deliberation any thing be spoken in our prayers against faith' and good manners. Their reason is good, and they are witnesses of it who hear the variety of prayers, before and after sermons, there where the Directory is practised, where (to speak most modestly) not only their private opinions, but also human interests, and their own personal concernments, and wild fancies born perhaps not two days before, are made the objects of the people's hopes, of their desires and their prayers; and all in the mean time pretend to the Holy Spirit.

§ 96. Thus far we are gone. The church hath 1) power and authority, and 2) command, and 3) ability, or promise of assistances, to make public forms of liturgy; and 4) the church always did so, in all descents from Moses to Christ, from Christ to the apostles, from them all to all descending ages; for I have instanced till S. Austin's time; and since, there is no question, the people were ἀντίγραφα ἔχοντες τῶν συνηθῶν ἁγιῶν εὐχῶν ἀπαράλλακτα, ὡς μεταγραφέντα ἐκ κοντακίων, as Balsamon[v] says of those of the Greek communion; 'they used unalterable forms of prayers, described out of the books of public liturgy.' It remains only that I consider upon what reason and grounds of prudence and religion the church did so, and whether she did well or no. In order to which, I consider,—

§ 97. First, every man hath personal needs of his own, and he that understands his own condition, and hath studied the state of his soul in order to eternity, his temporal estate in order to justice and charity, and the constitution and necessities of his body in order to health, and his health in order to the service of God, as every wise and good man does, will find that no man can make such provision for his necessities as he can do for his own; *cæteris paribus,* no man 'knows the things of a man but the spirit of the man[x];' and therefore if he have proportionable abilities, it is allowed to him, and it is necessary for him, to represent his own conditions to God; and he can best express his own sense, or at least best sigh forth his own meaning; and if he be a good man, the spirit will make intercession for him with those 'unutterable groans[y].' Besides this, every family hath needs proper to it in the capacity of a family, and those are to be represented by the master of the family; whom men of the other persuasion are apt to confess to be a priest in his own family, and a king; and *sacrorum omnium potestas sub regibus esto,* they are willing in this sense to acknowledge; and they call upon him to perform family duties, that is, all the public devotions of the family are to be ordered by him.

[v] [In respons. v. ad Marcum Alexandriæ patriarcham.—Jus Græco-rom., p. 365.]

[x] [1 Cor. ii. 11.]

[y] [Rom. viii. 26.]

§ 98. Now that this is to be done by a set form of words is acknowledged by Didoclavius[z], *Nam licet in conclavi paterfamilias verbis exprimere animi affectus pro arbitrio potest, quia Dominus cor intuetur et affectus, tamen publice coram tota familia idem absque indecoro non potest.* If he prays *ex tempore,* without a set form of prayer, he may commit many an undecency: a set and described form of prayer is most convenient in a family, that children and servants may be enabled to remember, and tacitly recite the prayer together with the Major-domo. But I rely not upon this, but proceed upon this consideration:—

§ 99. As private persons and as families, so also have churches their special necessities in a distinct capacity, and therefore God hath provided for them 'rulers and feeders,' priests and presidents of religion, who are to represent all their needs to God, and to make provisions. Now because the church cannot all meet in one place, but the harvest being great it is bound up in several bundles and divided into many congregations, for all which the rulers and stewards of this great family are to provide, and yet cannot be present in those particular societies, it is necessary that they should have influence upon them by a general provision, and therefore that they should take care that their common needs should be represented to God by set forms of prayer, for they only can be provided by rulers, and used by their ministers and deputies; such as must be one in the *principe,* and diffused in the execution; and it is a better expression of their care and duty, for the rulers to provide the bread and bless it, and then give it to them who must minister it in small portions and to particular companies (for so Christ did) than to leave them who are not in the same degree answerable for the churches as the rulers are, to provide their food, and break it, and minister it too. The very economy of Christ's family requires that the dispensations be made according to every man's capacity; the general stewards are to divide to every man his portion of work and to give them their food in due season, and the under servants are to do that work which is appointed them. So Christ appointed it in the gospel, and so the church hath practised in all ages; *Inde enim per temporum et sucessionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia supra episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur*[a]. When the rulers are few (for the ecclesiastical regiment is not democratical) and the under offices many, and the companies numerous, for all which those few rulers are bound to provide, and prayer and offices of devotion are one of the greatest instances of provision, it is impossible there should be any sufficient care taken or caution used by those rulers in the matter of prayers, but for them to make such prescript forms which may be used by all companies under their charge; that since they are to represent all the needs of all their

[z] Altare Damascenum. [cap. x. p. 614. ed. 4to. 1623.]
[a] S. Cyprian. ep. xxvii. [p. 66.]

people, because they cannot be present by their persons in all societies, they may be present by their care and provisions, which is then done best when they make prescript forms of prayer, and provide pious ministers to dispense it.

§ 100. Secondly, it is in the very nature of public prayer that it be made by a public spirit and performed by a public consent. For public and private prayer are certainly two distinct duties; but they are least of all distinguished by the place, but most of all by the spirit that dictates the prayer, and the consent in the recitation; and it is a private prayer which either one man makes, though spoken in public, as the Laodicean council calls ψαλμοὺς ἰδιωτικοὺς, 'private psalms,' or which is not attested by public consent of minds; and it is a public prayer which is made by the public spirit and consented to by a general acceptation; and therefore the Lord's prayer, though spoken in private, is a public form, and therefore represented plurally. And the place is very extrinsical to the nature of prayer: "I will that men pray everywhere, lifting up pure hands[b]," and retiring into a closet is only advised for the avoiding of hypocrisy, not for the greater excellency of the duty. So that if public prayer have advantages beyond private prayer, or upon its own stock besides it, the more public influences it receives, the more excellent it is. And hence I conclude that set forms of prayer,—composed and used by the church, I mean by the rulers in conjunction and union of heads and councils; and used by the church, I mean the people in union and society of hearts and spirits,—hath two very great advantages which other prayers have not.

§ 101. For first, it is more truly public, and hath the benefit of those helps which God, who never is deficient to supply any of our needs, gives to public persons in order to public necessities, by which I mean its emanation from a public and therefore a more excellent spirit. And secondly, it is the greatest instance of union in the world; for since God hath made faith, hope, and charity, the ligaments of the communion of saints; and common prayer which not only all the governments have propounded as most fit, but in which all the people are united, is a great testimony of the same faith, and a common hope, and mutual charity, because they confess the same God whom they worship, and the same articles which they recite, and labour towards the same hope, 'the mighty price[c] of their high calling[d],' and by praying for each other in the same sense and to the same purpose, doing the same to them that I desire they should do for me, do testify, and preserve, and increase their charity; it follows that common and described prayers are the most excellent instrument and act and ligament of the communion of saints, and the great common term of the church in its degrees of catholic capacity. And therefore saith S. Ignatius[e], πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ἅμα

[b] [1 Tim. ii. 8.]
[c] [So spelt up to Taylor's time.]
[d] [Phil. iii. 14.]
[e] [Ep. interpol. ad Magnes. § 7. p. 55.]

συνέρχεσθε, 'all meet together and join to common prayers:' μία δέησις, εἷς νοῦς ἔστω, 'let there be one mind and let there be one prayer.' That's the true communion of Christians.

§ 102. And in pursuance of this I consider, that if all christian churches had one common liturgy, there were not a greater symbol to testify, nor a greater instrument to preserve, the catholic communion; and whenever a schism was commenced and that they called one another heretic, they not only forsook to pray with one another, but they also altered their forms by interposition of new clauses, hymns and collects, and new rites and ceremonies. Only those parts that combined kept the same liturgy: and indeed the same forms of prayer were so much the instrument of union that it was the only ligament of their society; for their creeds I reckon as part of their liturgy, for so they ever were. So that this may teach us a little to guess, I will not say into how many churches but into how many innumerable atoms and minutes of churches those Christians must needs be scattered, who alter their forms according to the number of persons and the number of their meetings, every company having a new form of prayer at every convention. And this consideration will not be vain if we remember how great a blessing unity in churches is, and how hard to be kept with all the arts in the world, and how every thing is powerful enough for its dissolution. But that a public form of liturgy was the great instrument of communion in the primitive church, appears in this, that the καθαίρεσις or 'excommunication' was an exclusion *a communicatione orationis et conventus et omnis sancti commercii*, 'from the participation of the public meeting and prayers;' and therefore the more united the prayer is, still it is the greater instrument of union; the authority and consent, the public spirit and common acceptation, are so many degrees of a more firm and indissoluble communion.

§ 103. Thirdly, To this I add that without prescribed forms, issues of the public spirit and authority, public communion cannot be regular and certain, as may appear in one or two plain instances. It is a practice prevailing among those of our brethren that are zealous for *ex tempore* or not enjoined prayers, to pray their sermons over, to reduce their doctrine into devotion and liturgy. I mislike it not for the thing itself, if it were done[f] regularly for the manner, and the matter were[f] always pious and true. But who shall assure me, when the preacher hath disputed, or rather dogmatically decreed, a point of predestination or of prescience, of contingency or of liberty, or any of the most mysterious parts of divinity, and then prays his sermon over, that he then prays with the Spirit? Unless I be sure that he also preached with the Spirit, I cannot be sure that he prays with the Spirit, for all he prays *ex tempore*. Nay, if I hear a protestant preach in the morning and an anabaptist in the afternoon, to-day a presbyterian, to-morrow an independent, am I not most sure that

[f] ['done,' 'were,' om. B, C, D.]

when they have preached contradictories, and all of them pray their sermons over, that they do not all pray with the Spirit? More than one in this case cannot pray with the Spirit; possibly all may pray against Him.

§ 104. Fourthly, From whence I thus argue in behalf of set forms of prayer, that in the case above put, how shall I or any man else say Amen to their prayers that preach and pray contradictories? At least, I am much hindered in my devotion. For besides that it derives our opinions into our devotions, makes every school-point become our religion, and makes God a party so far as we can, entitling Him to our impertinent wranglings; besides this I say, while we should attend to our addresses towards God, we are to consider whether the point be true or no; and by that time we have tacitly discoursed it, we are upon another point which also perhaps is as questionable as the former; and by this time our spirit of devotion is a little discomposed, and something out of countenance, there is so much other employment for the spirit, the spirit of discerning and judging. All which inconveniences are avoided in set forms of liturgy: for we know beforehand the conditions of our communion, and to what we are to say Amen, to which if we like it we may repair; if not, there is no harm done, your devotion shall not be surprised nor your communion invaded, as it may be often in your *ex tempore* prayers, and unlimited devotions.

§ 105. Fifthly, And this thing hath another collateral inconvenience which is of great consideration; for upon what confidence can we solicit any recusants to come to our church, where we cannot promise them that the devotions there to be used shall be innocent, nor can we put him into a condition to judge for himself? If he will venture he may, but we can use no argument to make him choose our churches, though he would quit his own.

§ 106. Sixthly, So that either the people must have an implicit faith in the priest, and then may most easily be abused; or if they have not, they cannot join in the prayer, it cannot become to them an instrument of communion, but by chance, and irregularly, and *ex post facto*, when the prayer is approved of, and after the devotion is spent; for till then they cannot judge; and before they do, they cannot say Amen; and till Amen be said, there is no benefit of the prayer, nor any union of hearts and desires, and therefore as yet no communion.

§ 107. Seventhly, Public forms of prayer are great advantages to convey an article of faith[s] into the most secret retirements of the spirit, and to establish it with a most firm persuasion and endear it to us with the greatest affection. For since our prayers are the greatest instruments and conveyances of blessing and mercy to us, that which mingles with our hopes, which we owe to God, which is sent of an errand to fetch a mercy for us, in all reason will become

[s] [See Preface, § 23. p. 239 sq. supra.]

the dearer to us for all these advantages. And just so is an article of belief inserted into our devotions, and made a part of prayer; it is extremely confirmed by that confidence and πληροφορία, 'fulness of persuasion,' that must exclude all doubting from our prayers; and it insinuates itself into our affection by being mingled with our desires; and we grow bold in it by having offered it to God, and made so often acknowledgment of it to Him who 'is not to be mocked.'

§ 108. And certainly it were a very strange liturgy in which there were no public confession of faith, for as it were deficient in one act of God's worship, which is offering the understanding up to God, bringing it in subjection to Christ and making public profession of it, it also loses a very great advantage which might accrue to faith by making it a part of our liturgic devotions; and this was so apprehended by the ancients in the church, our fathers in Christ, that commonly they used to oppose a hymn, or a collect, or a doxology, in defiance of a new-sprung heresy. The fathers of Nice[h] framed the *Gloria Patri* against the Arians. S. Austin composed a hymn against the Donatists. S. Hierome added the *sicut erat in principio*, against the Macedonians. S. Ambrose framed the *Te Deum* upon occasion of S. Austin's baptism, but took care to make the hymn to be of most solemn adoration, and yet of prudent institution and public confession, that according to the advice of S. Paul[i] we might 'sing with grace in our hearts to the Lord,' and at the same time 'teach and admonish one another' too: now this cannot be done but in set forms of prayer; for in new devotions and uncertain forms we may also have an ambulatory faith and new articles may be offered before every sermon and at every convention; the church can have no security to the contrary, nor the article any stable foundation or advantageous insinuation either into the judgment or memory of the persons to be informed or persuaded, but like Abraham's sacrifice, as soon as his back is turned the birds shall eat it up. *Quid quod hæc oratio, quæ sanandis mentibus adhibetur, descendere in nos debet? Remedia non prosunt nisi immorentur*[k]. A cursory prayer shall have a transient effect, when the hand is off the impression also is gone.

§ 109. Eighthly, Without the description of public forms of prayer there can be no security given in the matter of our prayers but we may burn *assa fœtida*[l] for incense, and the marrow of a man's bones instead of the fat of rams; and of all things in the world we should be most curious that our prayers be not turned into sin; and yet if they be not prescribed and preconsidered, nothing can secure them antecedently; the people shall go to church, but without confidence that they shall return with a blessing, for they know not whether God shall have a present made of a holy oblation, or else whether

[h] [Compare Preface, as above; which was written many years later.]

[i] [Col. iii. 16.]

[k] Sen. ep. xl. [tom. ii. p. 138.]

[l] [So Sermon ii. on Spirit of Grace, tom. iv. p. 345.]

the minister will stand in the gap or make the gap wider. But this I touched upon before.

§ 110. Ninthly, They preserve the authority and sacredness of government, and possibly they are therefore decried that the reputation of authority may decline together. For as God hath made it the great cancel between the clergy and the people that they are deputed to speak to God for them, so is it the great distinction of the persons in that order that the rulers shall judge between the ministers and the people in relation to God, with what addresses they shall come before God and intercede for the people; for so S. Paul enjoins[m] that 'the spirits of the prophets should be submitted to the prophets,' viz., to be discerned and judged by them, which thing is not practicable in permissions of every minister to pray what forms he pleases every day.

§ 111. Tenthly, Public forms of liturgy are also the great securities and basis to the religion and piety of the people; for circumstances govern them most, and the very determination of a public office, and the appointment of that office at certain times, engages their spirits, the first to an habitual, the latter to an actual devotion. It is all that the οἱ πολλοὶ, 'many men' know of their religion; and they cannot any way know it better than by those forms of prayer which publish their faith and their devotion to God and all the world, and which by an admirable expedient reduces their faith into practice, and places their religion in their understanding and affections. And therefore S. Paul[n] when he was to give an account of his religion, he did it not by a mere recitation of the articles, but by giving account of his liturgy and the manner of his worship, "After that way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers."—And the best worship is the best religion, and therefore I am not to trust any man to make my manner of worshipping unless I durst trust him to be the dictator of my religion; and a form of prayer made by a private man is also my religion made by a private man; so that we must say, 'after the manner that G., the minister of B., shall conceive and speak, so worship I the God of my fathers;' and if that be reasonable or pious let all the world judge.

§ 112. Eleventhly, But when authority shall consider and determine upon a form of liturgy, and this be used and practised in a church, there is an admirable conjunction in the religion and great co-operation towards the glory of God. The authority of the injunction adds great reputation to the devotion, and takes off the contempt which from the no-authority of single and private persons must be consequent to their conceived prayers; and the public practice of it, and union of spirits in the devotion, satisfies the world in the nature of it, and the religion of the church.

§ 113. Twelfthly, But nothing can answer for the great scandal which all wise persons and all good persons in the world must needs

[m] [vid. 1 Cor. xiv. 32.] [n] [Acts xxiv. 14.]

receive when there is no public testimony consigned that such a whole nation, or a church, hath any thing that can be called religion, and those little umbrages that are, are casual as chance itself, alterable as time; and shall be good when those infinite numbers of men that are trusted with it shall please to be honest, or shall have the good luck not to be mistaken.

§ 114. Thirteenthly, I will not now instance in the vain-glory that is appendent to these new made, every-day forms of prayer, and that some have been so vain, like the orators Quintilian[o] speaks of, *ut verbum petant quo incipiant,* that they have published their *ex tempore* faculty upon experiment and scenical bravery, you shall name the instance and they shall compose the form; amongst whom also the gift of the man is more than the devotion of the man: nor will I consider that then his[p] gift is esteemed best when his prayer is longest; and if he takes a complacency in his gift (as who is not apt to do it?) he will be sure to extend his prayer till a suspicious and scrupulous man would be apt to say his prayer pressed hard upon that which our blessed Saviour reprehended in the pharisees, who 'thought to be heard for their much babbling[q].' I know it was observed by a very wise man[r], that the vanity of spirit and popular opinion that grows great, and talks loudly of his abilities that can speak *ex tempore,* may not only be the incentive but a helper of the faculty, and make a man not only to love it but to be the more able to do it. *Addit ad dicendum etiam pudor stimulos, addit et dicendorum expectata laus; mirumque videri potest, quod cum stilus secreto gaudeat, atque omnes arbitros reformidet, extemporalis actio auditorum frequentia, ut miles congestu signorum, excitatur. Namque et difficiliorem cogitationem exprimit et expellit dicendi necessitas, et secundos impetus auget placendi cupido. Adeo præmium omnia spectant, ut eloquentia quoque, quanquam plurimum habeat in se voluptatis, maxime tamen præsenti fructu laudis opinionisque ducatur.* It may so happen that the opinion of the people, as it is apt to actuate the faculty, so also may encourage the practice, and spoil the devotion. But these things are accidental to the nature of the thing, and therefore though they are too certainly consequent to the person, yet I will not be too severe, but preserve myself on the surer side of a charitable construction, which truly I desire to keep, not only to their persons whom I much reverence, but also to their actions. But yet I durst not do the same thing even for these last reasons, though I had no other.

§ 115. In the next place we must consider the next great objection that is with much clamour pretended, viz., that in set forms of prayer we restrain and confine the blessed Spirit, and in conceived forms when every man is left to his liberty, then the Spirit is free, unlimited, and unconstrained.—I answer,

[o] [Inst. or. x. 7. tom. i. p. 955.]
[p] ['this,' C, D.]
[q] [vid. Matt. vi. 7.]
[r] Quintil. [ubi supra, p. 954.]

§ 116. First, either their conceived forms (I use their own words, though indeed the expression is very inartificial) are premeditate and described, or they are *ex tempore*. If they be premeditate and described, then the Spirit is as much limited in their conceived forms as in the church's conceived forms. For as to this particular, it is all one who describes and limits the form, whether the church or a single man does it, still the Spirit is in constraint and limit; so that in this case they are not angry at set forms of prayer, but that they do not make them. And if it be replied that if a single person composes a set form he may alter it if he please, and so his spirit is at liberty; I answer, so may the church if she see cause for it, and unless there be cause the single person will not alter it, unless he do things unreasonable and without cause. So that it will be an unequal challenge and a peevish quarrel to allow of set forms of prayer made by private persons, and not of set forms made by the public spirit of the church: it is evident that the Spirit is limited in both alike.

§ 117. But if by 'conceived forms' in this objection they mean *ex tempore* prayers (for so they would be thought[s] most generally to practise it) and that in the use of these the liberty of the Spirit is best preserved; to this I answer, that the being *ex tempore* or premeditate will be wholly impertinent to this question of limiting the Spirit. For there may be great liberty in set forms, even when there is much variety; and there may be great restraint in *ex tempore* prayers, even then when it shall be called unlawful to use set forms: that the Spirit is restrained or that it is free in either, is accidental to them both, for it may be either free or not free in both as it may happen.

§ 118. But the restraint is this, that every one is not left to his liberty to pray how he list (with premeditation or without, it makes not much matter) but that he is prescribed unto by the spirit of another. But if it be a fault thus to restrain the Spirit, I would fain know is not the Spirit restrained when the whole congregation shall be confined to the form of this one man's composing? or shall it be unlawful, or at least a disgrace and disparagement, to use any set forms, especially of the church's composition? More plainly thus;—

§ 119. Secondly, Doth not the minister confine and restrain the spirit of the Lord's people when they are tied to his form? It would sound of more liberty to their spirits that every one might make a prayer of his own, and all pray together, and not be forced or confined to the minister's single dictate and private spirit. It is true it would breed confusions, and therefore they might pray silently till the sermon began, and not for the avoiding one inconvenience run into a greater, and to avoid the disorder of a popular noise restrain the blessed Spirit; for even in this case as well in the other, 'where the Spirit of God is there must be liberty[t].'

§ 120. Thirdly, If the spirit must be at liberty, who shall assure us this liberty must be in forms of prayer, and if so, whether also it

[s] ['taught,' C.]

[t] [2 Cor. iii. 17.]

must be in public prayer, and will it not suffice that it be in private? and if in public prayers, is not the liberty of the spirit sufficiently preserved that the public spirit is free, that is, the church hath power upon occasion to alter and increase her litanies? By what argument shall any man make it so much as probable that the Holy Ghost is injured if every private minister's private spirit shall be guided, and therefore by necessary consequence limited, by the authority of the church's public spirit?

§ 121. Fourthly, Does not the Directory that thing which is here called restraining of the Spirit? does it not appoint every thing but the words, and after this is it not a goodly *palladium* that is contended for, and a princely liberty they leave unto the Spirit, to be free only in the supplying the place of a vocabulary and a *copia verborum?* For as for the matter, it is all there described and appointed; and to those determined senses the Spirit must assist, or not at all, only for the words He shall take His choice. Now I desire it may be considered sadly and seriously, is it not as much injury to the Spirit to restrain His matter as to appoint His words? Which is the more considerable of the two, sense or language, matter or words? I mean when they are taken singly and separately. For so they may very well be, for as, if men prescribe the matter only, the Spirit may cover it with several words and expressions; so if the Spirit prescribe the words, I may still abound in variety of sense, and preserve the liberty of my meaning: we see that true in the various interpretations of the same words of scripture. So that in the greater of the two the Spirit is restrained when His matter is appointed, and to make Him amends for not trusting Him with the matter without our directions and limitations, we trust Him to say what He pleases, so it be to our sense, to our purposes: a goodly compensation surely!

§ 122. Fifthly, Did not Christ restrain the spirit of His apostles when He taught them to pray the Lord's prayer, whether His precept to His disciples concerning it was, 'Pray this,' or 'Pray thus;' 'Pray these words,' or 'Pray after this manner?' Or though it had been less than either, and been only a 'Directory' for the matter, still it is a thing which our brethren in all other cases of the same nature are resolved perpetually to call a restraint. Certainly then this pretended restraint is no such formidable thing. These men themselves do it by directing all of the matter and much of the manner, and Christ himself did it by prescribing both the matter and the words too.

§ 123. Sixthly, These restraints, as they are called, or determinations of the Spirit, are made by the Spirit himself. For I demand, when any Assembly of Divines appoint the matter of prayers to all particular ministers, as this hath done, is that appointment by the Spirit, or no? if no, then for aught appears this Directory not being made by God's spirit may be any enemy to it. But if this appointment be by the Spirit, then the determination and limitation of the Spirit is by the Spirit himself; and such indeed is every pious and prudent

constitution of the church in matters spiritual. Such as was that of S. Paul to the Corinthians, when he prescribed orders for public prophesying, and interpretation, and speaking with tongues. The spirit of some he so restrained, that he bound them to hold their peace; he permitted but two or three to speak at one meeting, the rest were to keep silence, though possibly six or seven might at that time have the Spirit.

§ 124. Seventhly, Is it not a restraint of the Spirit to sing a psalm in metre, by appointment? Clearly, as much as appointing forms of prayer, or eucharist; and yet that we see done daily, and no scruple made. Is not this to be partial in judgment, and inconsiderate of what we do?

§ 125. Eighthly, And now after all this strife, what harm is there in restraining the Spirit in the present sense? what prohibition? what law? what reason or revelation is against it? what inconvenience in the nature of the thing? For can any man be so weak as to imagine a despite is done to the Spirit of grace when the gifts given to His church are used regularly and by order? As if prudence were no gift of God's spirit, as if 'helps' in government and the ordering spiritual matters were none of those graces which Christ 'when He ascended up on high' gave unto men. But this whole matter is wholly a stranger to reason, and never seen in scripture.

§ 126. For divinity never knew any other vicious restraining the Spirit, but either suppressing those holy incitements to virtue and good life which God's spirit ministers to us externally or internally, or else a forbidding by public authority the ministers of the word and sacraments to speak such truths as God hath commanded, and so taking away the liberty of prophesying. The first is directly vicious *in materia speciali*, the second is tyrannical and antichristian; and to it persecution of true religion is to be reduced. But as for this pretended limiting or restraining the Spirit, viz. by appointing a regular form of prayer, it is so very a *chimæra* that it hath no footing or foundation upon any ground where a wise man may build his confidence.

§ 127. Ninthly, But lastly, how if the Spirit must be restrained, and that by precept apostolical? That calls us to a new account. But if it be not true, what means S. Paul by saying, "The spirits of the prophets must be subject[u] to the prophets?" What greater restraint than subjection? If subjected, then they must be ruled; if ruled, then limited; prescribed unto, and as much under restraint as the spirits of the superior prophets shall judge convenient.

I suppose by this time, this objection will trouble us no more. But perhaps another will.

§ 128. For why are not the ministers to be left as well to their liberty in making their prayers, as their sermons? I answer, The

[u] [ὑποτάσσεται, 1 Cor. xiv. 32.]

church may if she will, but whether she doth well or no, let her consider: this I am sure, there is not the same reason, and I fear the experience the world hath already had of it will make demonstration enough of the inconvenience. But however, the differences are many.

§ 129. First, Our prayers offered up by the minister are in behalf and in the name of the people, and therefore great reason they should know beforehand what is to be presented, that if they like not the message they may refuse to communicate; especially since people are so divided in their opinions, in their hopes, and in their faiths, it being a duty to refuse communion with those prayers which they think to have in them the matter of sin or doubting. Which reason on the other part ceases; for the minister being to speak from God to the people, if he speaks what he ought not, God can right Himself, however is not a partner of the sin, as in the other case the people possibly may be.

§ 130. Secondly, It is more fit a liberty be left in preaching than praying, because the address of our discourses and exhortations is to be made according to the understanding and capacity of the audience, their prejudices are to be removed, all advantages to be taken, and they are to be surprised that way they lie most open; "But being crafty I caught you," saith S. Paul to the Corinthians[v]. And discourses and arguments *ad hominem*, upon their particular principles and practices, may more move them than the most polite and accurate that do not comply and wind about their fancies and affections. S. Paul, from the absurd practice of being baptized for the dead[w], made an excellent argument to convince the Corinthians of the resurrection. But this reason also ceases in our prayers. For God understandeth what we say sure enough; He hath no prejudices to be removed, no infirmities to be wrought upon, and a fine figure of rhetoric, a pleasant cadence and a curious expression move not Him at all: no other twinings and compliances stir Him, but charity, and humility, and zeal, and importunity, which all are things internal and spiritual. It was observed by Pliny[x], *Deos ipsos non tam accuratis adorantium precibus quam innocentia et sanctitate lætari, gratioremque existimari qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem quam qui meditatum carmen intulerit.* And therefore of necessity there is to be great variety of discourses to the people, and permissions accordingly, but not so to God, with whom a *Deus miserere* prevails as soon as the great office of forty hours not long since invented in the church of Rome, or any other prayers spun out to a length beyond the extension of the office of a pharisee.

§ 131. Thirdly, I fear it cannot stand with our reverence to God to permit to every spirit a liberty of public address to Him in behalf of the people. Indeed he that is not fit to pray is not always fit to

[v] [2 Cor. xii. 16.]
[w] [So Duct. Dub., bk. i. ch. 2. rule 6.]
[x] Panegyr. Trajan. dictum. [cap. iii. tom. ii. p. 146.]

preach, but it is more safe to be bold with the people than with God, if the persons be not so fit: in that there may be indiscretion, but there may be impiety and irreligion in this; the people may better excuse and pardon an indiscretion or a rudeness, if any such should happen, than we may venture to offer it to God.

§ 132. Fourthly, There is a latitude of theology, much whereof is left to us so without precise and clear determination, that without breach either of faith or charity men may differ in opinion; and if they may not be permitted to 'abound in their own sense[y],' they will be apt to complain of tyranny over consciences, and that men lord it over their faith. In prayer this thing is so different, that it is imprudent and full of inconvenience to derive such things into our prayers which may with good profit be matter of sermons; therefore here a liberty may well enough be granted when there it may better be denied.

§ 133. Fifthly, But indeed, if I may freely declare my opinion, I think it were not amiss if the liberty of making sermons were something more restrained than it is, and that either such persons only were intrusted with the liberty for whom the church herself may safely be responsive, that is, to men learned and pious, and that the other part, the *vulgus cleri*, should instruct the people out of the fountains of the church and the public stock, till by so long exercise and discipline in the schools of the prophets they may also be intrusted to minister of their own unto the people. This I am sure was the practice of the primitive church, when preaching was as ably and religiously performed as now it is; but in this I prescribe nothing. But truly I think the reverend divines of the Assembly are many of them of my mind in this particular, and that they observe a liberty indulged to some persons to preach, which I think they had rather should hold their peace, and yet think the church better edified in their silence than their sermons.

§ 134. Sixthly, But yet methinks the argument objected so far as the *ex tempore* men make use of it, if it were turned with the edge the other way would have more reason in it; and instead of arguing, 'Why should not the same liberty be allowed to their spirit in praying as in preaching?' it were better to substitute this, 'If they can pray with the Spirit, why do they not also preach with the Spirit?' And it may be there may be in reason, or experience, something more for preaching and making orations by the excellency of a man's spirit and learning, than for the other, which in the greatest abilities it may be unfit to venture to God without public approbation. But for sermons, they may be fortunate and safe if made *ex tempore; Si calor ac spiritus tulit (frequenter enim accidit ut successum extemporalem consequi cura non possit) Deum tunc adfuisse cum id evenisset veteres oratores, ut Cicero dicit, aiebant*[z]. Now let them make demonstra-

[y] [Rom. xiv. 5. ed. vulg.]

[z] Quintil. De extemporal. facult. [Inst. or.] lib. x. cap. 7. [tom. i. p. 952.]

tion of their spirit by making excellent sermons *ex tempore*, that it may become an experiment of their other faculty, that after they are tried and approved in this they may be considered for the other: and if praying with the Spirit be praying *ex tempore*, why shall not they preach *ex tempore* too, or else confess they preach without the Spirit, or that they have not the gift of preaching? For to say that the 'gift of prayer' is a gift *ex tempore*, but the gift of preaching is with study and deliberation, is to become vain and impertinent. *Quis enim discrevit*, 'who hath made them of a different consideration,' I mean as to this particular, as to their efficient cause? Nor reason, nor revelation; nor God, nor man.

§ 135. To sum up all. If any man hath a mind to exercise his gift of prayer, let him set himself to work and compose books of devotion, (we have need of them in the church of England, so apparent need that some of the church of Rome have made it an objection against us,) and this his gift of prayer will be to edification; but otherwise I understand it is more fit for ostentation than any spiritual advantage. For God hears us not the sooner for our *ex tempore*, long, or conceived prayers; possibly they may become a hindrance, as in the cases before instanced. And I am sure if the people be intelligent and can discern, they are hindered in their devotion, for they dare not say Amen till they have considered, and many such cases will occur in *ex tempore* or unlicensed prayers that need much considering before we attest them: but if the people be not intelligent, they are apt to swallow all the inconveniences which may multiply in so great a license; and therefore it were well that the governors of the church, who are to answer for their souls, should judge for them before they say Amen; which judgment cannot be without set forms of liturgy. My sentence therefore is, ἵνα μένωμεν ὥσπερ ἐσμὲν, 'let us be as we are already;' few changes are for the better.

§ 136. For if it be pretended that in the liturgy of the church of England, which was composed with much art and judgment, by a church that hath as much reason to be confident she hath the spirit and 'gift of prayer' as any single person hath; and each learned man that was at its first composition can as much prove that he had the Spirit as the objectors now-a-days (and he that boasts most certainly hath the least:) if, I say, it be pretended that there are many errors and inconveniences both in the order and in the matter of the Common Prayer-Book, made by such men, with so much industry: how much more and with how much greater reason may we all dread the inconveniences and disorders of *ex tempore* and 'conceived' prayers; where respectively there is neither conjunction of heads, nor premeditation, nor industry, nor method, nor art, nor any of those things, or at least not in the same degree, which were likely to have exempted the Common Prayer-Book from errors and disorders. 'If these things be in the green tree, what will be done in the dry?'

§ 137. But if it be said, The *ex tempore* and 'conceived' prayers will be secured from error by the Directory, because that chalks them out the matter; I answer, it is not sufficient, because if when men study both the matter and the words too, they may be, and it is pretended are actually deceived, much more may they when the matter is left much more at liberty, and the words under no restraint at all. And no man can avoid the pressure and the weight of this unless the compilers of the Directory were infallible, and that all their followers are so too, of the certainty of which I am not yet fully satisfied.

§ 138. And after this I would fain know what benefit and advantages the church of England in her united capacity receives by this new device? For the public, it is clear that whether the ministers pray before they study, or study before they pray, there must needs be infinite difformity in the public worship, and all the benefits which before were the consequents of conformity and unity will be lost; and if they be not valuable I leave it to all them to consider who know the inconveniences of public disunion, and the public disunion that is certainly consequent to them who do not communicate in any common forms of worship; and to think that the Directory will bring conformity is as if one should say that all who are under the same hemisphere are joined *in communi patria*, and will love like countrymen. For under the Directory there will be as different religions, and as different desires, and as differing forms, as there are several varieties of men and manners under the one half of heaven, who yet breathe under the same half of the globe.

§ 139. But I ask again, what benefit can the public receive by this form, or this no form, for I know not whether to call it. Shall the matter of prayers be better in all churches? shall God be better served? shall the word of God and the best patterns of prayers be always exactly followed? It is well if it be: but there is no security given us by the Directory; for the particulars and special instances of the matter are left at every man's dispose for all that, and we must depend upon the honesty of every particular for it: and if any man proves an heretic or a knave, then he may introduce what impiety he please into the public forms of God's worship, and there is no law made to prevent it; and it must be cured afterward if it can, but beforehand it is not prevented at all by the Directory, which trusts every man.

§ 140. But I observe that all the benefit which is pretended is that it will make an able ministry. *Maximus vero studiorum fructus est, et velut præmium quoddam amplissimum longi laboris, ex tempore dicendi facultas*, said an excellent person[z]. And it is very true; to be able to speak excellent things without long considering, is an effect of a long industry, and greatest learning; but certainly the greatest enemy in the world to its production: much learning and long use of speaking may enable a man to speak upon sudden occa-

[z] Quintil. [Inst. or., lib. x. cap. 7. init. tom. i. p. 949.]

sions, but speaking without consideration will never make much learning. *Nec quisquam tantum fidat ingenio ut id sibi speret incipienti statim posse contingere, sed sicut in cogitatione præcepimus, ita facilitatem extemporalem a parvis initiis paulatim perducemus ad summam*[a]; and to offer that as a means of getting learning which cannot be done at all as it ought but after learning is already gotten in a very great degree, is highest mistaking. I confess I am very much from believing the allegation, and so will every man be that considers what kind of men they are that have been most zealous for that way of 'conceived' prayer: I am sure that very few of the learnedst, very many ignorants, most those who have made least abode in the schools of the prophets. And that I may disgrace no man's person, we see tradesmen of the most illiberal arts, and women, pretend to it, and do it with as many words (and that's the main thing), with as much confidence and speciousness of spirit, as the best amongst them[b]. *Nec fortuiti sermonis contextum mirabor unquam, quem jurgantibus etiam mulierculis superfluere video*, said Quintilian[c]. And it is but a small portion of learning that will serve a man to make 'conceived' forms of prayer, which they may have easily upon the stock of other men, or upon their own fancy, or upon any thing in which no learning is required. He that knows not this, knows nothing of the craft that may be in the preacher's trade. But what? is God better served? I would fain see any authority, or any reason, or any probability for that. I am sure ignorant men offer Him none of the best sacrifices *ex tempore*, and learned men will be sure to deliberate, and know God is then better served when He is served by a public than when by a private spirit. I cannot imagine what accruements will hence come to the public; it may be some advantages may be to the private interests of men. For there are a sort of men whom our blessed Saviour noted, "who do devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers." They 'make prayers,' and they 'make them long;' by this means they receive double advantages, for they get reputation to their ability, and to their piety. And although the Common Prayer-Book, in the Preface to the Directory, be charged with unnecessary length, yet we see that most of these men, they that are most eminent or would be thought so, make their prayers longer, and will not lose the benefits which their credit gets, and they by their credit, for making their prayers.

§ 141. Add this, that there is no promise in scripture that he who prays *ex tempore* shall be heard the better, or that he shall be assisted at all to such purposes; and therefore to innovate in so high a matter without a warrant to command us or a promise to warrant us, is no

[a] Ibid. [p. 954.]

[b] Κόμιζε το νυν τὸ μέγιστον μὲν τὴν ἀμαθίαν, εἶτα θράσος ἐπὶ τούτοις· καὶ ἄλλως δὲ τόλμαν καὶ ἀναισχυντίαν. αἰδῶ δὲ, ἢ ἐπιείκειαν, ἢ μετριότητα, ἢ ἐρύθημα, οἵκοι ἀπόλιπε· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ βοὴν ὅτι μεγίστην, κ.τ.λ.—Lucian. [Rhet. præcept., cap. xv. tom. vii. p. 224.]

[c] [Ubi supra, p. 952.]

better than vanity in the thing and presumption in the person. He therefore that considers that this way of prayer is without all manner of precedent in the primitive church, against the example of all famous churches in all christendom in the whole descent of fifteen ages, without all command or warrant of scripture; that it is unreasonable in the nature of the thing, against prudence and the best wisdom of humanity, because it is without deliberation; that it is innovation in a high degree, without that authority which is truly, and by inherent and ancient right, to command and prescribe to us in external forms of worship; that it is much to the disgrace of the first reformers of our religion; that it gives encouragement to the church of Rome to quarrel, with some reason and more pretence, against our Reformation, as being by the Directory confessed to have been done in much blindness, and therefore might err in the excess as well as in the defect, throwing out too much as casting off too little (which is the more likely because they wanted no zeal to carry them far enough): he that considers the universal difformity of public worship, and the no means of union, no symbol of public communion being publicly consigned; that all heresies may with the same authority be brought into our prayers, and offered to God in behalf of the people, with the same authority that any truth may, all the particular matter of our prayers being left to the choice of all men of all persuasions; and then observes that actually there are in many places heresy, and blasphemy, and impertinency, and illiterate rudeness, put into the devotion of the most solemn days and the most public meetings; and then lastly, that there are divers parts of liturgy for which no provision at all is made in the Directory, and the very administration of the sacraments left so loosely that if there be any thing essential in the forms of sacraments, the sacrament may become ineffectual for want of due words and due administration; I say, he that considers all these things (and many more he may consider) will find that particular men are not fit to be intrusted to offer in public with their private spirit to God, for the people, in such solemnities, in matters of so great concernment, where the honour of God, the benefit of the people, the interest of kingdoms, the being of a church, the unity of minds, the conformity of practice, the truth of persuasion, and the salvation of souls, are so much concerned as they are in the public prayers of a whole national church. An unlearned man is not to be trusted, and a wise man dare not trust himself: he that is ignorant cannot, he that is knowing will not.

ON

THE REVERENCE

DUE TO THE ALTAR.

ON

THE REVERENCE

DUE TO THE ALTAR[a].

S[r],

I PERCEIVE that you also in this generall disrelish of the Practises of H. Church have an interest, and yet onely so farre, as *ex timorata Conscientiâ* to scruple at that of which you are sufficiently convinced in your Understanding. Indeed S[r] it is observed amongst those who have experience of Soules that the Scrupulous man is an honest man, but alwayes the weakest: this I attribute to your age, and the publike Dyscrasy, the other to God, and your good Conscience. But that I may in this also doe you service, I shall according to your desire give you an account of those reasons which move the Church in her addresses to the place of publike worship, but especially the Altar, to adore God Almighty with lowly bendings of the Body. I shall doe it in asserting of several propositions, all which make up the whole account, that I may, (for it is lawfull to Christians, though forbidden to the Jewes,) by steps ascend to the Altar, and so discover the nakednesse of them that oppose it.

God is to be worshipped.

First S[r] I take for graunt this onely (for I shall prove all the rest) that God is to be worshipped. It is the maine buisinesse of our life, the end of our creation, the perfection of the Creature, the τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα of his being reasonable, and endowed with excellent facultyes of body and understanding; and although wee usually make it a πάρεργον, yet nor God, nor nature intended it soe. God is to be worshipped with our best, nay all our facultyes.

This worship must be externall as well as internall.

I say with our facultyes of body, as well, as soule, for in this case God lookes for no lesse then a Holocaust, or whole burnt offering, body, and soule. Nay, the body itself is a Sacrifice that God must have presented to him, not upon, but at his Altar. Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς (saith S. Paul) παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, your bodyes a

[a] [This tract is printed from a MS. recently discovered in the library of Queen's college, Oxford. The evidence for its genuineness will be given in the Life of Bp. Taylor. It was thought that it would interest the reader to see it exactly as it is in the MS. in respect of spelling, punctuation, &c.]

living Sacrifice, and the manner of this S. Paul subjoynes in the following wordes ἁγίαν, and λογικὴν λατρείαν. It must be holy, or a Sacrifice ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις in holy offices, and it is λατρεία, in the worship of God; all which put together say thus much: Your bodyes must be offered up as a Sacrifice in God's worship, that is in adoration (for that's God's worship Corporall) at the Altar (for it is a Sacrifice). But besides the Command, see the reasons, for it is λογικὴ λατρεία, saith S. Paul, a reasonable worship, or a worship according to right reason.

1. How shall we hope to have our bodyes glorifyed by God, if wee will not glorify God in our bodyes? 2. How shall all the workes of God praise him, if our bodyes which are God's workmanship doe not in their manner this worke of God, that is to worship, and praise him? 3. As the soule and body make up a complete man, so the adoration of both makes the Complete Leiturgy: for *actiones sunt suppositorum* saith Philosophy.

4. It is the duty of the second Commandement to worship God with externall adoration, and reverence. The first Commandement commands internall to God, and therefore denyes it to Idols: the second Commandement denyes worship to Idols: externall worship (for else we confound the 2 first Commandments worse than the Church of Rome does) and therefore asserts it to God, for that is Idolatry to give that to an Idol, which is due to God, *Quoniam is honos idem tribuitur aliis ipse omnino non colitur*, saith Lactantius[b]. There are yet 7000 in Israel saith God to the Prophet, that have not bowed their knees to Baal, that is, that were not Idolaters, for they were to bow their knees in divine worship onely to the God of Israel. Προσκυνεῖν τὰ ἀγάλματα is forbidden in the second Commandement, therefore προσκυνεῖν τὸν Θεὸν is the præceptive part of it. And Epiphanius[c] reports it to be a hæresy of the Osseni, that they sayd it was no sin *etiamsi simulachra ipsos adorare contingat persequutionis tempore instante, si solum in Conscientiâ non adorent*; to adore with their bodyes though their soules detested it was Idolatry, and to deny it was hæresy.

Now let us take a short estimate of προσκυνεῖν and that will end this buisinesse. The Wise men of the East came to the Babe lying in the Manger, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, They bowed downe, and worshipped him. Πάντα σοι δώσω ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι, if thou wilt fall downe, and worship me. Now marke Christs answer to the tempter Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, we must adore, or worship God, that is, so as the Devill would have had Christ done to him, πεσὼν, falling, or bowing downe the body. Thus Dagon was found in Azotus ἐπὶ τοῦ προσκυνοῦντος τὴν κιβωτὸν σχήματος κείμενον, saith Josephus[d]; in the posture of a worshipper;

[b] lib. 2. Institut: [scil. per tot. libr., tom. i. p. 112 sqq.]

[c] lib. 1. contr: Hæres: cap. 19. [§ 1. vol. i. p. 40]

[d] [Antiq. Jud.] lib: 6. c. 1. [tom. i. p. 224.]

how's that? See it 1. Sam: 5. 4. Dagon was fallen upon his face to the earth, that is, σχῆμα προσκυνοῦντος, the guise of worshippers. And thus it is used both in prophane, and sacred authors, for externall veneration alwayes, ἀνάγκην σφι προσφερόντων προσκυνέειν βασιλῆα προσπίπτοντας, saith Herodotus in Polymnia[e]. προσκυνῶ γε πρῶτα μὲν τὸν ἥλιον etc. Aristoph: in Pluto[f]. τὴν φάτνην προσκύνησον. S. Greg: Nazian: Orat[g].

This being the meaning of προσκύνησις, or worship of God; understand all those places of Scripture, where we are called on to worship God, to bow downe to him, to fall downe before his footstoole, of externall, or corporall adoration. For where the externall is onely expressed, there although the internall be also meant, as being the root from whence the externall must come, yet there the externall is not excluded. That which is onely nam'd is not onely to be left out, especially since externall worshippings are expresse acts of duty, and subordination to the person worshipped. Thus to be uncovered in these Westerne parts is a tendry of our service, and ever was since *donare pileo* was to make a free man of a slave. But among all nations inclining of the head, or bowing of the face to the ground, nay even in nature it selfe it is a duty of inferiours to Superiours, for it is *deponere magnificentiam propriam,* to lay our glory at the feet of another, that's a true προσκύνησις, a worship, or adoration. And this not to be given to God, or to be given to an Idol, does promerit God's anger. Esa: 2. 9. They *worship* the worke of their owne hands. How doe they worship it? The meane man boweth downe, and the great man humbleth himselfe, therefore forgive them not. I think it is cleare that worship of God supposes externall, and to worship God in spirit is not opposed to worship him in body; for it might as well exclude honouring God with our Substance (as Solomon bids[h]), for of themselves our bodyes are as spirituall as our money; and then as we should not come, and bow down low before his footstoole[i], so neither should we bring[k] an offering, and come into his courts. Nay spirituall worship no more excludes bodily, then *corde creditur* does exclude *ore fit confessio;* unlesse we say that faith is no part of divine worship: for if it be, then spirituall is not onely internall, or at least excludes not the other. *Colere Deum etiam externis ritibus est adorare eum spiritu, et veritate, si procedant ex sanâ doctrinâ cum decore Sanctitatis, et dilectionis,* saith S. Austin.

This externall worship must be where he is specially present.

The next step to the Altar is, that God is there specially to be worshipped, where he is most præsentiall. For although God bee present in all places alike in respect of his essence, yet he exhibits the

[e] [vid. cap. 136.]
[f] [lin. 771.]
[g] [xxxviii. § 17, tom. i. p. 674 C.]
[h] Prov: 10.
[i] psal. 95.
[k] psal. 96.

issues, and effects of his presence more in some then in others. And that thither the addresses of our adorations must be where God is specially present, nature teaches us. We looke men in the face when we speake to them, and if we may any where pray to God, and adore him because he is every where present and heares us, then by the same reason we must specially adore him where he is specially present, (because his presence is the determination of our addresse) that is in Heaven, and in all Holy places; And therefore the generall addresse of our devotion is towards heaven; so Christ taught us to say, *Pater noster qui es in Cœlis* etc. so we doe in lifting up our eyes, and hands for there is his court, and his glorious *satellitium* of Angells, and his royall throne. But this generall addresse is limited by a more speciall, and that is in Holy places, places consecrate to the service of God by acts of publike, and religious solemnity, in them, and from them to Heaven. Thus it was in Solomon's Temple[l]; If they pray towards this place, then heare thou in Heaven etc. *Est ergo Altare in Cœlis. Illuc enim preces nostræ, et oblationes nostræ diriguntur: et ad Templum quemadmodum Johannes in Apocalypsi ait, et apertum est Templum Dei, et Tabernaculum. Ecce enim inquit, Tabernaculum Dei in quo habitabit cum hominibus:* saith S. Irenæus[m]. For Gods seat is in Holy places: his presence is there; his face is there: his feet is there: his throne is there.

He is present specially in Heaven, and in all Holy places.

See this by constant testimony of Scripture: Jacob in Bethel, surely saith he God is in this place: how know you Jacob? Oh, says he, it is the house of God, and the Gate of Heaven. *Quam reverenda sunt hæc loca!* When God had given direction to Moses for the Tabernacle and to place the Cherubims before the Mercy seat, that God tooke up his residence there was so knowne a thing, that it became to him like an attribute, or an appellative; Oh thou that sittest betweene the Cherubims, said David[n]; The Philistins had soone learnd that; for when the Arke was come into the campe of the Hebrews they were affrayd, for they sayd, God is come into the Campe[o].

His seate is there.

Gods presence is there. Serve the Lord with gladnesse, and come before his 'presence' with a song. Psal. 100. for though this be the same with the former, yet they are severall expressions us'd by God himselfe. And therefore the Arke was called the Tabernacle of the Congregation, not because of the peoples meeting with the preist, and one with another, but Gods meeting with the people. Num. 7. 4. And thou shalt lay them in

His presence is there.

[l] 1 Kings 8. 35.
[m] [vid.] cap. 34. [al. cap. xviii. § 6.] lib. 4. adv: Hæres: [p. 252.]
[n] Psal: 80. 1.
[o] 1 Sam: 4. 7.

the tabernacle of the congregation where I will meet with you. And when Moses had any buisinesse of particular consequence with God, thither he went, for there he knew he was. 7. Num: v. 89. And when Moses was gone into the Tabernacle of the Congregation 'to speake with him,' he heard the voyce etc.

His face is there. His face is there. This is intimated to us in the shewbread layd upon the table of the proposition in the Tabernacle, which was called amongst the Hebrewes, Facebread; and the 70 expressly reads it ἄρτους ἐνωπίους, countenance loaves, bread set there where Gods countenance is present.

His throne is there and his feet are there. His throne, and feet are there. The place of my throne, and the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name shall they no more defile, in setting their threshold by my threshold, and their posts by my posts. Ezek: 43. 7. And againe, The glory of Lebanon . . shall beautify the place of my Sanctuary, and I will make the place of my feet glorious.

His memoriall is there. Gods memoriall is there. An Altar of earth shalt thou make mee . . in all places where 'I record my name' I will come and blesse thee[q]. In the places where. he appoints himselfe to be worshipped, there he records his name, and there he promises his presence, and that will bring a blessing, where I record my name 'I will come' and blesse thee. All these are but various expressions of that which the prophet David speakes in plaine termes[r], The Lord is in his Holy Temple the Lords seat is in Heaven.

Therefore they are Holy. The consequence of these is playnely thus much, Therefore these places are holy, therefore proper for Divine adoration. That they are holy is plaine, not onely by consequence, but in direct terms: Gods Sanctuary is called the beauty of Holinesse[s], and the beauty of Holinesse must needs be Holy, and

Therefore we are to worship there. therefore *Adorate Dominum,* worship the Lord in the beauty of Holinesse. There they are together. And againe Holinesse becommeth thy house for ever, Holinesse for Holy places, *Sancta Sanctis:* Holinesse is its ornament, and beauty psal: 93. That's one of them, the other is in psal: 99.

And that by command. Exalt the Lord our God, and fall downe before his footstoole. Nay at Gods approximation to Moses in the Bush, God commanded him to be discalceate, and gives no other reason for it, but because the ground was Holy[t]; it was an essentiall

[q] Exod: 20. v. 24.
[r] psal: 11. 4.
[s] psal: 96. 9.
[t] Exod: 3. 5.

consequent, reverence or adoration to Holinesse. The place was Holy, and yet it was but *in vicinia præsentiæ Domini*, God was but hard by it. Nay the ground near Jericho became Holy at the presence of an Angel, and yet it was not enough for Joshuah[u] to bow there, and worship, but he must pull of his shooes too, according to the custome of those Easterne people, and as his[x] M[r] Moses had done before him.

And Example. Thus farre we have command. Let us have example too. It is the forequoted text. And Joshuah did so. That is, he did his worship in that Holy place. David a little further in an æqual case, he did his worship toward it, that though he was not there, yet his adoration might relate thither. ps: 138. 2. I will worship toward thy Holy Temple: and Daniel did soe when he was farre enough off, as farre as Babylon from Jerusalem. Nay themselves plac'd their dead with their faces towards the Temple; and so the Fathers were buried in Hebron, which is South from Jerusalem; they are layd North, and South as Venerable Bede observes it[y]: the same devotion that Catholike Christians have now adayes, and alwayes had to ly East and West, as if to rise w[t] their faces towards the East, where the Christian Altar is placed, and our Sacrifice commemorated.

Obj: Oh but whats all this to us? The Jewes might well doe according to the exigence of the Ceremoniall Law but we must not. This was all Judaicall. *Sic obgannire solent.*

Though we had no particular caution for this, we should not be much troubled with this objection. 1. Because there is enough in nature, and reason to satisfy, because all this is no more, then what the Patriarchs by the Law, and light of Nature did, as Jacob at Bethel. 2[ly]. God gave commands, and rules for this whole buisinesse before the Ceremoniall Law was taught, as to Moses, to Josuah, or at least to one of them. 3[ly]. These commands were not peremptory, but reasonable; grounded upon the æquity of the thing: and when Moses did discalceate, he did it by virtue of the reason; for either God commanded that veneration, because it was essentiall reason it should be so, or else Moses did it for that reason, for else it was unreasonable to urge a reason to command an action, if the reason were not sufficient of it selfe to enforce either the command, or the action. 4[ly]. Where did God command adoration towards the Holy or consecrate places in all the Ceremoniall Law? and yet David did it, and Daniel did it, and Solomon prayed for a blessing upon such addresses, and yet none of these men lov'd a curse so well, as to adde any thing to Moses Law, therefore they did it by the dictate of the Law of Nature.

[u] Joshua 5. 15. [x] [i. e. 'master.'] [y] lib: 5. hist: c. 18. [tom. iii. col. 133.]

And this holinesse in consecrate places is in the new Testament.

But (thanke God) we are sufficiently instructed in the New Testament for this particular; for the Law of Nature runs alwayes through the veynes of all true religions, onely in the church of the Jewes this was the more explicate, because their Liturgy was much upon the externall, and this also is as explicate in this particular in the Gospell because it is an act of holinesse. And first I shall lay this for a ground that whatsoever Christ taught as for the future was doctrine purely Evangelicall. For hee never spoke at all for the observation of the Ceremoniall Law that we read of in Scripture; the tithing mint, and cummin was the neerest to be ceremoniall, but it was not indeed, and if it had, yet our B. Saviour tells them of their duty in that particular, as in the tyme past, these ought ye to have done.

Christ taught it.

Now see what Christs doctrine was. Hee whip'd the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, and for his authority quoted a prophecy intended for the Gospell, by the confession of all sides and the exigence of the place it selfe. My house shall be called an house of prayer to all people. Christ meant not this of the Jewish Temple, but of Christian Churches. 1. Because he knew the Temple was shortly to be destroyed, and he told his Disciples so. 2ly. It was such Temples as must be for all nations; that could not be the Jewes Temple, for to bring in Greekes thither would have defiled it (for such was their objection against S. Paul for introducing Trophimus and the H. Ghost answers the objection not by excusing, but by denying the fact) and to bring in any of the uncircumcision would have prophan'd that, and so they must have done. For circumcision was now abolished, and yet all nations must pray in Gods house. 3. Then when Christ urged this place, he quoted it in the future tense κληθήσεται: although this house shall be destroyed, yet *Domus mea domus orationis vocabitur*. Well! here we see was a house for prayer in the tyme of the Gospell, and this was Gods house *Domus mea* God hath tooke seisure of it: and here God will dwell. For howbeit God dwelleth not in Temples made with handes (it was S. Stephens exception) yet in the same place he answers, that Solomon built him a House for all that. A house not to circumscribe him, but for him to manifest his presence in by peculiar issues of his favour, and his holinesse. In this sense is all. And so Christ speaking concerning swearing[a], whoso sweareth by the temple sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. God dwells in his owne houses, that is in houses of prayer. For these places put together say as much. Adde to these a third, and that is, that these places are holy, and therefore better then any thing else that is not separate for so divine a use: which is better of the gold, or the temple that Sanctifyeth the gold? The very stones of the

[a] Matth: 23. 21.

Temple, or church are better in God's æstimate then unhallowed gold, nay then gold that is hallowed of the Temple: where observe that gold receives a holinesse from a church where it is offered, and that therefore the Church is more Holy, for it must have more then it gives, unlesse it should empty it selfe, and by hallowing the gold become it selfe unsanctifyed. Now this which Christ sayd is of an eternall truth, for it is a dictate of the Law of Nature, or right reason, no part of Moses Law, and therefore as Evangelicall as any other dictate whatsoever; which is the more credible too, because it was a peice of an Evangelicall sermon that Christ was preaching.

Nay we have an Altar too erected us by Christ in his first Sermon that he preach'd. For directing his disciples how they should in the tyme of the Gospell make their addresses to God he charges them if at any time they come to offer with malice couchant in their breasts, that they should leave their gift at the Altar, and goe, be reconciled. There we have for the Gospell places of prayer, and a place for oblation: a church, and an Altar. *Igitur Ecclesiæ oblatio quam Dominus docuit offerri in Universo mundo purum Sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum,* saith S. Irenæus[b] upon this very place. *Oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic*[c]. *Sacrificia in populo, Sacrificia in Ecclesia:* and a little after *Ita ad ipsum verbum dedit populo præceptum faciendarum oblationum, quamvis non indigeret eis, ut disceret Deo servire. Sic et ideo nos quoque offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione.* And Christ tooke an order that these and all other holy things should be kept from prophanation in that Evangelicall præcept deliver'd in the same sermon[d], *Nolite dare Sanctum Canibus,* give not things holy to dogs, that is to prophane persons, keepe holy things from unholy men, dogs must not come into Churches. For without shall be dogs. Rev: 22. It was spoken of the cælestiall temple, of which ours are adumbrations, or rather ours are the gates of that. Bethel or Gods house is the gate of Heaven. But cleerely, and litterally here is a distinction of Holy and prophane, which is very materiall to this discourse and the ground of all.

It was prophecyed of.

And all this is no more then was prophecyed of before Christs comming[e]. The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the firre tree, the pine tree, and the box together to beautify the place of my Sanctuary, and I will make the place of my feet glorious; of my feet, that is, of my residence in holy places according to the analogy, and stile of the old Testament. And that

[b] [lib. iv.] c: 34. [al. xviii. § 1.] adv: hæres: [p. 250.]

[c] vide lib: 2. constit: Apostol: [cap. 57.] Tertull: de oratione: cap. 10. [p. 133.] Eusebium de vita Constantini: lib: 4. c: 41. [p. 648.] Cyril: Hierosolymitanum Catech: Myst: 5. [§ 3. p. 326.] ubi ritum reconciliationis ante offertorium ab hoc loco derivari, videre est.

[d] Matth. 7. 6.

[e] Esa: 60. 13. 14.

this was fulfilled in the Gospell S. John tells us in his Revelation. 21. 3. And I heard a great voice out of Heaven saying, Behold the Tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himselfe shall be with them, and hee shall be their God. And this text is to this purpose cited by S. Irenæus an Apostolicall man. lib. 4. *advers: hæres:* cap: 34[f].

It was fulfilled.

Thus in the very cradle of the church, the Apostles and first Christians had their Synaxes in Churches. Their houres of prayer they kept in the temple, and had their meetings as long as they could for feare of the Jewes, and for the necessity of their travell. At Corinth we find a Church, and that of so much veneration, that S. Paul would not suffer them to keepe their feasts of charity in it. Have ye not houses to eate, and drinke in, or despise ye the church of God? The Eucharist was to be eaten in their church, and their Agapæ in their owne houses. And from hence was it that the Councell of Laodicea borrowed her 28 Canon[g] *οὐ δεῖ τὰς ἀγάπας ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς ἢ ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις ποιεῖν.* To this I shall adde the saying of S. Clement, whose name S. Paul saith was written in the booke of life in his unquæstion'd epistle to the Corinthians[h], *Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους τάς τε προσφορὰς, καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι . . . . ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τινῶν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν ὑπερτάτῃ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει.* Our Lord (saith he) by his supreme will hath taken order for the Tymes, and the Places of our oblations, and liturgyes, and by whom they shall be ministred. He hath taken an order, that is, he hath determin'd the Tymes, and Places, houres, and dayes of prayer in churches or oratoryes. And so it came to passe saith Epiphanius[i]. *Et fuerunt quidem antiquitus orationum loci tum inter Judæos extra civitatem, tum inter Samaritas, velut etiam in Actibus Apostolorum invenimus, ubi purpurarum venditrix Lydia Paulo occurrit, et sic quoque divina Scriptura narrat quod videbatur locus orationis esse, et accesserunt et docuerunt Apostoli mulieres, quæ illo tempore convenerant.*

The summe is this. Where God is present, there he is to be worshipped, and so according to the degree of his presence. He is specially present in Holy places, as Temples, Churches, Altars, therefore here are the places of our adoration. Such places are in the Gospell, as well as in the Law of Moses, for they are here both by the Law of Nature, and of the Gospell too. And although here I might conclude, that in Churches, and at Altars God is to be adored by the bendings, and prostrations of the body (for these premises inferre thus much) yet I shall give a particular account of the behaviour of

[f] [al. xviii. fin. p. 252.]
[g] [tom. i. col. 785.]
[h] [cap. xl.] pag: 52. [al. p. 170.]
[i] lib. 3. hæres: 80. viz. contra Massalianos. [§ 1. p. 1068 A.]

Christians in Churches, and specially at Altars, for that being a place of the greatest Sanctity, there ought to be the expressions of the greatest devotion.

And worshippings in Churches were accordingly.

The prophecy of Esaiah concerning the liturgyes Evangelicall told us beforehand our dutyes. Esa: 60. 13. 14. I will make the place of my feet glorious, and beautify my Sanctuary, the sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee, and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves downe at the soles of thy feet, that is in the Christian Sanctuary, for the Sanctuary God calls the place of his feet.

In the tymes of the Apostles.

All they that despised thee, speaking by a Prosopopœia to the Christian Church, that is, the Gentiles shall bow in thy holy places. And so S. Paul told them, that if they prophecyed, or prayed in knowne tongues εἰσέλθωσι δὲ ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι, if there come in ignorant people, or unbeleivers, they are converted. And what doe they upon that conviction? πεσόντες ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσουσι τῷ Θεῷ[j]; they will fall downe on their faces, and worship God: but where is this? ἐὰν συνέλθῃ ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, when the church is assembled in one place; adoration in the church plainely, and why there, and then? ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὄντως ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι, because God verely is amongst you. I[k], but it seemes God is not there for the Sanctity of the place, or by way of residence, but in case you prophecy so as to be understood, then sayth S. Paul, the unbeleiver will say God is amongst you, that is by way of assistance. I answer that the collection is not *ad mentem Apostoli*, for though they speake with tongues, yet God is amongst them, for saith S. Paul, the spirit truly prayeth viz: in various tongues, Gods spirit is there in languages, but if they prophecy so as to be understood, then the heathen can say best that God is amongst you; so that unlesse you prophecy though God be amongst you, yet the unbeleiver knows not whither he be, or noe, and so cannot truly affirme, that he is: but he is ὄντως as S. Paul sayes, veryly, and indeed, though the Heathen know it not, for the peoples understanding cannot make God there more present, unlesse we should say that because the people cannot, therefore God does not understand, which were blasphemy. The issue of this is the same which the 5 generall Councell held at C. P. observes (*sub Menná* act: 5.[l]) that the church is οἶκος προσκύνητος, a worshipping house, or a house appointed for the worship, or adoration of God Almighty.

[j] 1 Cor: 14. 24. 25.

[k] [i. e. 'yea.' See Minshew.]

[l] [In libell. monach. ad Menam patriarch., tom. ii. col. 1288 A.]

And in all descending ages, but determined to the East, or towards the Altar.

This worshipping, or adoration in Churches was not so indefinite, but that it was instantly limited to be towards the East, or the place of the Altar, insomuch that amongst the first blossomes of Hæresyes, that of the Osseni was reckoned by Epiphanius[m], of whom Alxai the false Jew was a Coryphæus, *prohibet enim* (saith the father) *orare ad orientes, asserens non oportere sic intendere,* saying we ought not addresse our devotions, or adorations that way. That was his hæresy; for that thither our adorations are to be directed is an Apostolicall tradition, if we will beleive as authentick records, as any we have extant. Justin Martyr in *Resp. ad Qu:* 118 *ad Orthodoxos*[n], having sayd that the Church hath received order for the place, and manner of prayer from the Apostles (as S. Clement[o] sayd we had from Christ) addes, *ideo Christianos omnes precum tempore spectare ad Orientem: quia ortus tanquam mundi pars honoratior, adorationi Dei destinatus est.* Marke that; the East is the determin'd place for adoration: and this by the practise of all Christians, and this taught from the Apostles. The certainty of this derivation from the Apostles is further to be seene in Origen. *Homil.* 5. *in Numer:*[p] in Tertullian cap. 16. *Apologet:*[q] S. Gregory Nyssen *in lib. de Oratione*[r]. Athanasius *Quæst:* 14. *de plurimis et necessariis quæst:*[s] and divers others.

The reasons of this determination of Christian worship are diversly given by the Fathers according to their various Conceptions, all whereof, or the most were postnate to the thing, and are to be seene in S. German's *Theorica*[t] *rerum Ecclesiast:*[u] and Damascen: lib. 4. *orthod: fid:* cap. 13.[x] where he sayes this addresse of our adoration is *studiose observanda, Christum scil: cum in cruce penderet ad occasum prospexisse, eoque nomine ita adoramus, ut eum obtueamur.* The true reason I know not, I meane that which was truly introductive of the practise, for postnate there are enough, but this I know, that our adoration thitherward, and the placing of the Altar there were cœtaneous for ought appeares, and if I may have leave to conjecture, I think that this was the truer reason of the addresse of our worship, even because the Altar was *Positum in Oriente;* my reason is this;

As being a place of more Sanctity and priviledge.

1. Because I find in antiquity προσκυνεῖν πρὸς ἀνατολὰς, and ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου used promiscuously, and, 2[ly], because I find in antiquity the prærogative of holinesse not given to the orientall

[m] cap. 19. [§ 3.] contra Hæres: lib. 1. [p. 42 A.]
[n] [p. 491 E.]
[o] [Const. Apostol. ii. 57. Epist. ad Jacobum, cap. xiv. pp. 263, 615.]
[p] [§ i. tom. ii. p. 284 F.]
[q] [p. 16.]
[r] [De orat. domin. Orat. v. tom. i. p. 755 C.]
[s] [Scil. Ad Antioch., quæst. xxxvii. tom. ii. p. 276 B.]
[t] [leg. 'Theoria.']
[u] [p. 148.] S. Thomas 2 2[æ] q. 84. art: 3. [tom. xi. part. 2. p. 200 b.]
[x] [al. 12. tom. i. p. 266 B.]

part of Heaven, but to the site of the Altar in the Church I doe: which two things put together methinks say, that therefore the adoration was alwayes that way, because the Altar or Holy Table (for the difference is but nominall) being alwayes like the tree of Paradise planted in the East, and being more Holy then the other parts of the Church, I meane by a relative holinesse, did best determine our worship, as having God there the most presentiall. And if I be not mistaken, Walafridus Strabo[y] shall confirme it; for when he had reckoned three Altars, one at Jerusalem, one in the Pantheon at Rome, the other in S. Peters that were not set in the East as examples of singular exception from the Common rule addes, *Usus tamen frequentior et rationi vicinior habet in Orientem Orantes converti.* Though these Altars were not in the East, yet the most common use is for worshippers to turne to the East when they pray. As if their addresse to the East was onely because of the Altar's being there placed.

For it was separate from the people for the preists onely, and Ministers.

For 1. The Altar was alwayes the place of Preists in the Christian Church, the preist's peculiar, for none but he was to enter in thither, insomuch that S. Ambrose would not permit the Emperour Theodosius to enter παρὰ τὰς κιχλίδας, as Theodoret[z] reports, within the Cancells of the Altar to make his oblation there: and although this was in the Greeke Church permitted to the Emperour, yet it was against the Law of the Catholike Church, as appeares in the 19 Canon[a] of the Councell of Laodicea, which was before the 1 Nicene[b], μόνοις ἐξὸν εἶναι τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ κοινωνεῖν, *et Can:* 44.[a] *Concil: Agath: Can:* 66.[c] *Concil: C. P. in Trullo Can:* 69.[d] And it was a punishment for Preists to be thrust *in laicam communionem,* that is, to be put out of the sept, or Cancell of the Altar to communicate, as appeares in the Canons of many Councells.

And in approaches to it were the degrees of reconciliation.

2. In proportion to this were the degrees of prærogative severally indulged to severall people, the Altar being the *terminus* of reconciliation, the several stations of pœnitents were the degrees of approximation to it: The κλαίοντες in the Church-porch, the ἀκροώμενοι, by the reading place, the ὑποπίπτοντες, at the chancell doore, the *fideles* up to the very rayles, that was their height.

Altars were places of Refuge.

3. The Altars had alwayes in all religions, as if by the law of Nature, and so also by the same analogy in

[y] lib: de reb: Eccles: c. 4. [p. 953.]
[z] lib: 5. c: 18. [al. 17. tom. iii. p. 1046, 50. Sed leg. κιγκλίδας.]
[a] [tom. i. coll. 784, 9.]
[b] [See p. 296. not. l, above.]
[c] [tom. ii. col. 1005.]
[d] [tom. iii. col. 1688.]

the Gospell a *Jus Asyli*, it was a Sanctuary. Our Altars are therefore a mercy seat, not onely because Christ is on them, who is our Ἱλαστήριον (Rom. 3. 25.) or mercy seat, but also because offenders that fled thither were defended from Death, or violence. It is observed by Josephus[e], that in the Hebrew tongue the same word signifyes a Temple, and Safety, *τὸ γὰρ ἱερὸν τὰ σόλυμα κατὰ τῶν Ἑβραίων ὠνόμασε γλῶσσαν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀσφάλεια*, because there was safety to them, that fled thither, to their Altars. It was alwayes so in the Christian Church: S. Gregory Nazianzen[f] gives us a fayre testimony of it. *Illa autem cum nulla ratione hanc vim effugere posset, consilium capit non majoris audaciæ quam prudentiæ plenum, ad Sacram etenim mensam confugit.*

Vultis in vincula rapere? vultis in mortem? Voluntas est mihi, non ego me vallabo circumfusione populorum, nec altaria tenebo, vitam obsecrans, saith S. Ambrose Ep. 33.[g] But for this see Socrates lib. 7. cap. 33.[h] Cassiod: lib. 12.[i] Niceph: lib: 14. c. 32.[k] The reason of this right of Sanctuary at Altars was the Sacrednesse of the place, that none durst draw them away, that had throwne themselves into its protection. And this Right God himselfe would see kept inviolate, for when Souldiers sent from Stilicho drew Cresconius from the Altar by violence, S. Ambrose fell downe before the Altar, and wept, but the Souldiers were miserably torne in peices by Leopards, saith Paulinus in his Life[l]. Nay further yet; For himselfe hath undertaken to be the Guardian of them who fly thither for Sanctuary. psal: 27. 4. 5. v: One thing have I desired of the Lord which I will require, even that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the fayre beauty of the Lord, and to visit his Temple. For in the time of trouble he shall hide me in his tabernacle, yea in the secret place of his dwelling shall he hide mee, and set me up upon a rocke of stone.

And of most solemne prayer.

4. Altars were the places, where the Christians always performed their most solemne devotions, and in cases of afflictions went thither to impetrate God's favour. Thus Gorgonia[m] went to the Altar to be cured of her feaver, and was miraculously delivered: Alexander Bp. of Constantinople being persecuted by the Arrians *ad altare progressus in faciem coram Sacra mensa se prostravit, et cum lachrymis oravit:* saith Epiphanius[n]. S. Ambrose being affrayd of Justina's fury, *sub altari positus sibi, et Ecclesiæ Deum Defensorem parabat*, saith Ruffinus[o]: and their liturgyes were

[e] lib. 7. c. 3. Antiq: [§ 2. p. 287.]
[f] Orat: 20. in laudem Basilii M. [al. orat. xliii. § 56. tom. i. p. 811 C.]
[g] [al. xx. § 8. tom. ii. col. 854 C.]
[h] [p. 382.]
[i] [cap. iv.]
[k] [tom. i. p. 505.]
[l] [§ 34. S. Ambros. opp., tom. ii. append. col. 10.]
[m] Nazianz: orat: 11. in laud: Gorgon: [al. orat. viii. § 18. tom. i. p. 229.]
[n] lib. 2. tom: 2. Hæres: 68. [§ 5. p. 722 A.]
[o] lib: 11. cap: 16. [p. 252.]

alwayes performed at the Altar, I meane the most solemne parts of it in all ages of the Christian Church.

Mira loci pietas, et prompta precantibus ara
Spes hominum placida prosperitate juvat[p].

And the seat of Christs body and bloud.

5. And lastly, (which containes the reason of the former, and of its holinesse) the Altar or Holy Table is *sedes Corporis et Sanguinis Christi.* S. Chrysost: *hom:* 21[q]. in 2 Cor: *et alibi.* And if the Altars, and the Arke and the Temple in the Law of Nature and Moses were Holy, because they were Gods Memorialls, as I shewed above, then by the same reason shall the Altar be ὑπεράγιον, highly Holy, because it is Christs Memoriall, there we commemorate his Death, and passion in the dreadfull, and mysterious way that himselfe with greatest mysteriousness appointed. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, doe this for my memoriall.

Christs Memoriall.

The place of Christian Sacrifice.

Here are all the Christian Sacrifices presented. *Panem accepit, et calicem similiter et suum Sanguinem confessus est et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in Universo mundo offert Deo,* saith that Apostolicall man S. Irenæus[r]. Wee doe beleive that Christ is there really present in the Sacrament, there is the body and bloud of Christ which are 'verely, and indeed' taken and received by the faithfull, saith our Church in her Catechisme. Now if places became holy at the presence of an Angell, as it did in Josuahs case to whom the captaine of the Lords Host appeared, and in Jacobs case at Bethel, and in all the old Law, for God alwayes appeared by Angells, shall not the Christian Altar be most holy where is present the blessed Body and bloud of the Sonne of God? I[s] but, what when the Sacrament is Gone? The relation is there still, and it is but a relative Sanctity we speake of, it is appointed for his Tabernacle, it is consecrate to that end, and the destination of man, the presence of the Sonne of God, the appointing it to a most holy end, the employment in a most sacred worke, and the presence of Angels (which, as S. Peter saith, desire to looke into these mysteryes,) if all this be not enough to make a thing most holy, there is no difference, nor can be any in the world betweene Sacred and prophane.

A place of Angels.

But I mentioned Angels, and let me tell you that the Catholike Fathers alwayes thought the Holy sept, or the Altar place to be full of Angels. I shall name two, or three and doe you judge of it. This I am sure that the Sacredness of the employment, and the glory of the mystery will as well require it; and the Fathers from the excellency of the thinge can as well know that

[p] Prudent: περὶ στεφανῶν hymn: 11. [lin. 175. tom. ii. p. 1181.]

[q] [al. xx. § 3. tom. x. p. 581.]

[r] lib: 4. adv. hæres: cap. 32. [al. xvii. § 5. p. 249.]

[s] [See p. 326, note k, above.]

the Angels are there as the Jewes could know that they were in their temple, *qui tamen ea de re nulli dubitarunt,* as may be seene in the Oration Agrippa made to the Jewes to dehort them from rebelling against the Romans *apud Josephum*[t].

But see their testimonyes. *Non dubites assistere, Angelum, quando Christus assistit, Christus immolatur,* saith S. Ambrose[u]. τότε καὶ Ἄγγελοι παρεστήκασι τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ οὐρανίων δυνάμεων ἅπαν τὸ βῆμα[v] βοᾷ, καὶ ὁ περὶ θυσιαστήριον πληροῦται τόπος εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ κειμένου, saith S. Chrysostome[x]. The place of the Altar ecchoes out at the noyse of heavenly powers. Then the Angels stand by the preist and the place is filled with them in honour of him that lyes on the Altar. The expression is Rhetoricall, but the *intentum,* the thing is dogmaticall. For I pray else what is the meaning of S. Paul, Let the woman have covering on her head in the church, 'because of the Angels,' but because as S. Chrysostomes[y] phrase is, the Church is *locus Angelorum,* the place of Angels? according to that admirable expression of the prophet David psalm: 68. v: 17. The charets of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels, and the Lord is among them, as in the Holy place of Sinai. that is, amongst those Angels, just as he is when he is in his Holy places, and the mountayne destinate for his Temple.

Adorned with glorious epithetes by the whole voice of Christendome.

Well! *Sit anima mea cum Christianis.* I pray God I may goe into the lot of the Christians: this is, and alwayes hath beene Christianity to speake highly of the Sanctity of Altars. Σεπτὸν θυσιαστήριον, the venerable Altar saith the councell of C. P.[z] ζωοποιὰ τράπεζα, the life-bringing table, saith Damascen *de imagin: orat:* 2[a]. and ζωόφορος[a], the same. τοῦ Θεοῦ θυσιαστήριον, Gods Altar so Dyonisius, τὸ θεῖον θυσιαστήριον, the same S. Denys[b], and the 12 Councell of Toledo[c]. *Compositum, et Sacrosanctum Altare* by S. Ambrose[d]. *Reverendum* by Eusebius Emissenus. *hom:* 4. *de Pascha*[e]: *Mensa Mystica, et Regalis* by S. Chrysostom. *homil:* 6. *ad populum Antiochen:*[f] and *de Eucharistiâ in Encæniis*[g], and τράπεζα τὸν ἀμ-

[t] [De bell. Jud., lib. ii. cap. 16. § 4 sqq. p. 1084.]

[u] In 1 cap. Lucæ. [ver. 11. tom. i. col. 1275.]

[v] [al. ἅπαν τάγμα.]

[x] lib. 6. de Sacerd: [cap. 4. tom. i. p. 424 C.]

[y] Hom. 36. in 1. Cor. [§ 6. tom. x. p. 340 D.—Taylor adopts the same interpretation of this text, Life of Christ, part ii. sect. 11. disc. viii. § 8. tom. ii. p. 321. In another place, the angels are understood as bishops, Episcopacy asserted, § ix. p. 37 supra.—But see a third account of the passage, below, Liberty of Prophesying, sect. iii. § 4.]

[z] Concil: 5. gen: C.P. [scil. sub Menna vid. p. 326. not. l, supra, et not. v, infra.] act: 6. [σεβασμίοις θυσιαστηρίοις, in epist. Hormisd., tom. ii. col. 1309 E.]

[a] [14, et orat. i. § 16. tom. i. pp. 337 D, 314 A. Sed leg. ζωοποιὸς, ζωηφόρος.]

[b] cap. 3. Eccl: Hier: [pp. 88, 9, et passim.]

[c] [can. vi. 'divinum altarium,' tom. iii. col. 1722.]

[d] cap. 8. lib. de his qui initiantur mysteriis. [tom. ii. col. 336.]

[e] [leg. hom. v. p. 560 D.]

[f] [vid. in 1 Cor. hom. xxiv. § 5. tom. x. p. 218.]

[g] [al. De pœnit. hom. ix. tom. ii. p. 349 D.]

νὸν ἔχουσα. *orat:* 24. *in* 1 Cor. 10[h]. θυσιαστήριον φρικωδέστερον. Chrysost: *hom:* 20. in 2. Cor.[i] ἱερὰ, φρικτὴ, εἰρήνης τοῦ Χρίστου τράπεζα *idem. orat:* 55[k]. τὸ βασιλικὸν σῶμα καθήμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου[l]. Gods Chayre of state, the Tabernacle of Christs glory; so the Greeks called it, as Genebrard[m] notes out of Simeon Thessalonicensis. *Oculus Ecclesiæ.* So every where ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ θρόνος Θεοῦ καὶ ἱλαστήριον, saith Synesius[n]. Gods throne, and mercy seat. That I may say of the holy Altar, as David of the Holy city, Glorious things are spoken of thee oh thou Altar of God.

And the adorations of the primitive Christians were there devoutly made.

The actions of the church were accordingly, for thither shee made her worshippings, there she did her divine adorations, and to it they exhibited religious reverence. When I have showne you this I shall trouble you no more, or but very little. I shall put them both together, and then give you a distinct account.

As appeares in S. Denys.

In the 2. booke of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy attributed to S. Denys[o], wee find this practise of a Devout person, τὴν ἱερὰν ἀσπαζόμενος τράπεζαν. Saluting the Holy Table.

Tertullian.

Nothing more famous then Tertullians *aris Dei adgeniculari cap:* 9. *de pœniten:*[p] Pamelius in his edition of Tertullian, reads it *Charis,* contrary to the faith of all ancient copyes, for no man before him ever read it so, as you shall easily observe in those controversy writers that spoke before Pamelius came out with his crotchet.

S. Greg: Nazian:

S. Gregory Nazianzen[q] speaking of his sister Gorgonia τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσπίπτει μετὰ τῆς πίστεως. She falls downe with faith before the Altar. And τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑαυτῆς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσθεῖσα, submitting or bowing her head to the Altar. The same Father in 40 oration[r] gives a command, αἰδέσθητε τὴν μυστικὴν τράπεζαν. Reverence, or have in veneration the mysterious table.

S. Athanasius.

S. Athanasius tom: 2. *Quod duæ in Christo naturæ.* p. 304. Edit: Paris[s]: καὶ νῦν οἱ προσίοντες τῷ ἁγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ περιπτυσσόμενοι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ μετὰ φόβου, καὶ χαρᾶς ἀσπαζόμενοι. Entering to the Holy Altar, embracing it, and saluting it etc.

Socrates reports of Alexander Bishop of Alexandria εἰς τὸ θυσιασ-

[h] [vid. not. d, infra.]
[i] [§ 3. tom. x. p. 581 C.]
[k] τράπεζα ἁγία, θυσιαστήριον ἄχραντον y[e] inviolable altar, so Gregory Nyssen serm: de baptismo. [?]
[l] [Chrysost. in 1 Cor. hom. xxiv. § 5. tom. x. p. 218 E.]
[m] [De Græcor. ritt. in Bibl. vett. patr. De la Bigne, fol. Par. 1610. tom. vi. col. 101.]
[n] In catast: j[a]. [vid. pp. 301 B, 302 B.] et Germanus in Theoriâ. [p. 133.]
[o] [p. 77 A.]
[p] [p. 127.]
[q] Orat: 11. de Soror: Gorgon: [al. orat. viii. § 18. tom. i. p. 229.]
[r] [§ 31. tom. i. p. 716 B.]
[s] [A.D. 1627.]

τήριον ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα ἐκτείνας εὔχεται. Entering into the sept of the Altar, he prostrates himselfe at the foot of, or under the holy Table, and extended, or being flat on his face he prayes.

S. Hierom. S. Hierom in his 48. *ad Sabinianum*[t] reprehends him for a villainous practise in the Church, for being in love with a Mayden, he layd love letters by the Altar just where shee should come to adore, which showes plainely the practise of the faithfull people in that tyme. *Tu* (saith he) *inter ostia quondam præsepis Domini, nunc altaris amatorias epistolas fulciebas, quas postea illa miserabilis, quasi flexo adoratura genu inveniret.*

Prudentius. Marke but the addresse of a christian Captaine, and his camerade to a battell.

——— *Deus unus, Christus utrique*
Hujus adoratis altaribus, et cruce fronti
Inscriptâ, cecinere tubæ.
lib: 2. *contra Symmachum*[u].

First they would adore God at his Holy Altar, and then to battell.

Concil: C. P. sive 6tum Generale. Μακροθυμήσατε ἀδελφοὶ, ἵνα πρότερον προσκυνήσωμεν τὸ ἅγιον θυσιαστήριον. sayd the Councell of Constantinople *sub Mennâ* act. 5.[v] *Summum altari subjectans verticem,*

S. Ambrose. we find in S. Ambrose, lib. 1. *de Virgin:*[w]

And wee find it complaind of as a fault, *In altaria, atque in Sacraria Dei, passim omnes sordidi, ac flagitiosi sine ulla penitus reverentia sacri honoris irrumpunt:*

Salvian. It was the complaint of Salvian. lib. 3. p. 93.[x] To come thither without reverence or veneration is sordid, and flagitious. And no wonder, for it was the Hæresy of the Euchetæ, or *Massaliani, Templorum et Ararum adjecere contemptum* (saith Damascen *de hæres:*[y]) I would our people knew this, and car'd for't. Nay Synesius *epist:* 67.[z] blames himselfe highly, that being a sinner hee should dare to touch Gods Altar, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἀπότροφος θυσιαστήριον ἡψάμην Θεοῦ. Holinesse becommeth Holy places, to come thither *religio est,* and it must be with addresses of religion σέβω . . ὕλην ζωηφόρον, τράπεζαν τὴν τὸν

Damascen. ἄρτον ἡμῖν τῆς ζωῆς χορηγοῦσαν, saith Damascen. *de Imagin: Orat:* 1.[a] and *orat:* 2.[b] we find a

[t] [al. ep. xciii. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 757.]
[u] [lin. 711. tom. ii. p. 825.]
[v] [See p. 326. note l, and p. 331. note z, above.]
[w] [cap. 11. tom. ii. col. 162.]
[x] [al. p. 50.]
[y] [§ 80. tom. i. p. 97 B.]
[z] [p. 217 B.]
[a] [§ 16. tom. i. p. 314 A.—Οὐκ ὕλη ἡ ζωηφόρος τράπεζα; κ.τ.λ.]
[b] [§ 14. tom. i. p. 337 D.—Ζωοποιὸς τράπεζα.]

Maria Egyptiaca. σέβας καὶ προσκύνησις τῆς ζωοποιῆς τραπέζης. Nay S. Mary of Egypt did with veneration kisse the ground where that holy thing was set, saith Damascen: *orat:* 3.[c] ῥίψασα τοίνυν ἐμαυτὴν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο προσκυνήσασα ἔδαφος etc. And the reason is expressed by S. Chrysostom. S. Chrysostom hom: 21.[d] in 2. Cor: c. 10. σὺ δὲ τὸ μὲν θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο τιμᾷς ὅτι δέχεται τοῦ Χριστου σῶμα. Thou doest reverence or honour the Altar, because it is the seat of the body of Christ.

The Greeke Liturgyes. And in the Rubrick of S. Chrysostoms liturgy[e] nothing more ordinary then ποιοῦσι πρὸς ἀνατολὰς προσκυνήματα τρία. And στάντες πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, προσκυνοῦσι, And ὄπισθεν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν and the same ἔμπροσθεν. And these adorations the Greekes called μετανοίας, as is every where to be seene in the Greeke Liturgyes, and in the Jus G. R. because the very frequent multiplying of them was injoyned them as speciall acts of devotion by their confessors.

And the Latin. The same is very frequent in the old Latin offices. In the *Ordo Romanus*[f] almost every where. *Pontifex inclinato capite ad altare* p. 2. *et* p. 7. *se altari inclinans, et adorato altari;* The same if you please you may see in the *Missa latina Antiqua*[g], which is confessedly 1000 yeares old, and was set forth by protestants to be a redargution of the surreptions, and innovations in the later Missals. I should tire you, and my selfe too, if I should transcribe but the tith of the Instances, that are every where in the ancient liturgyes, specially in that famous one called *Missa Mozarabum*[h]. These witnesses are enough to make faith of the practise of the primitive church, how shee behaved her selfe in her addresses into the Churches, and specially her ascents to the Altar.

One thing I desire to warne you of, that is that these phrases of *adorato altari,* and προσπίπτειν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, and προσκυνεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν, must be understood warily and as they were meant: not that any divine adoration was given to the altars either relatively, or transitively, but 1. They are the Metonymicall expressions of the subject for the adjunct: *adoratis altaribus,* that is, *adorato Christo præsente in altaribus: inclinato capite ad altare,* that is, *inclinato capite ad Deum ibidem, atque in sacris residentem:* and wee have good warrant to authorize this expression—for saith our Blessed Saviour, When you goe into a house ἀσπάζεσθε ἑαυτὴν[i],

[c] [tom. i. p. 389 A.]
[d] [al. xx. § 3. tom. x. p. 581 E.]
[e] [passim, tom. xii. p. 776 sqq.]
[f] [In Biblioth. max. vett. patr., tom. xiii. p. 657 sqq.]
[g] [p. 7. et passim. 8vo. Argentin. 1557.]
[h] [Bibl. vett. patr. De la Bigne, fol. Par. 1610. tom. vi. col. 87 sqq.]
[i] [ἀσπάσασθε αὐτὴν, Matt. x. 12.]

salute, or worship it, not the walls, but the inhabitants, so it is for altars. Thus Alexander worshipped the name of God written upon Jaddus the High Preists Mitre. Alexander did neither adore Jaddus, nor the Mitre; *οὐ τοῦτον εἶπε προσεκύνησα, τὸν δὲ Θεὸν οὗ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην αὐτὸς τετίμηται*, saith Josephus *antiqu:* lib. 11. c. 8.[j] So is ours. Our worship is towards holy places, but the adoration is intended to God. But this is in case of divine worship, for such worship is onely for God, and neither relatively, nor transitively is for the Altar, much lesse is it there to be determin'd.

But there is a veneration, or reverence to be given to holy things for their relative Sanctity, and this is the same in degree with civill worship, onely it is distinguished in the matter, this being *in materiâ religionis*, or for the relative Sanctity, or relation to God, that being for the politicall excellency, or superiority. This is distinguished from divine worship not in the externall, but by the internall, that is by the act, or intention of the worshipper, for if it be to acknowledge a divine excellency, then it is divine adoration, and must bee onely for God, if to acknowledge a relative, or subordinate Sanctity, then it may be to the Altar, but the internall must destinguish it, for although the bending corporally be the same, yet the understanding, or soule must make a difference. Thus Abigail when she came to David shee fell on her face, and worshipped, *προσεκύνησε* is the word, she ador'd; the externall was the same with that in her devotions, yet no idolatry neither. Thus when David called after Saul from the Cave of Engedi, David stooped with his face to the earth, and bowed himselfe. He could no lower to God Almighty then the earth, but the heart or intention is it that makes the difference. By this we have another exposition of the forequoted authorityes of the Fathers, for although to the Altar they gave externall bendings, yet this was no divine worship, it was but religious, and that for the relation to God Almighty. And this passed from the Altar to God Almighty. Heare their owne Testimony. *Πάντα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνακείμενα προσκυνοῦμεν, αὐτῷ δὲ τὸ σέβας προσάγοντες*, saith Damascen. lib. 4. *orthod: fid:* c. 12.[k] and S. Chrysostom in the place before quoted[l], hom: 21. in 2. Cor: *Tu autem altare hoc honoras* (not for any innate excellency in it selfe, much lesse for any latent divinity, but) *quia suscipit corpus Domini*, for its relation to the body of Christ for which it is appointed as an Arke or Tabernacle.

If you ask how this differs from worshipping God before an Image? I answer, onely in these two thinges. 1. Because one is forbidden, the other is not. 2[ly] Because an Image hath no relative Sanctity in it, God is not present there as he is at altars. If this will not satisfy you, but that you still suspect a snake, and feare least this worship, which is neither ultimate, nor divine at all, but in degree no more

[j] [§ 5. p. 503.] [k] [al. cap. 11. tom. i. p. 265 B.] [l] [not. d, supra.]

then civill, though in matter religious, and in manner relative, if, I say, you still suspect, then I pray S^r doe but conster[m] that saying of God to the Children of Israel. Levit: 19. v. 30. Yee shall keepe my sabbaths, and 'reverence my Sanctuary.' Is this reverence other then religious? If not I am sure it cannot be less then relative. And then you have a religious relative reverence to be given to things consecrate by the command of God himselfe. *Quam reverenda sunt hæc loca,* sayd Jacob at Bethel. I but perhaps this reverence is nothing but a high, and reverent esteeme of it. Suppose it be not; yet I am sure doing bodily curtesy to a thing cannot be more then a high, and reverent estimation in the soule, take it how you will, provided it be but proportionate to the esteeme, for we must have it no more and then it is but an expression of the inward, and so cannot be greater. But you shall not for this beleive me, nor your selfe onely. When God bad Moses pull of his shooes because the ground was holy, this was *mandatum reverendi locum quia Sanctus est,* saith Rupertus Abbas, Hugo de S. Victore, Tostatus, Dyonisius, Carthusianus, and Cajetan upon the place. So that reverence my Sanctuary is as much as all this comes too, which I was affrayd you should scruple at in the sayings of the Fathers.

And if you will hear a man not præjudic'd for this side speake, I name the man, Amesius, and I thinke he speakes home enough in his cases of Conscience. l. 4. c. 31. §. 1[n]. *An religiosa reverentia, et honor deferenda sint iis rebus quæ spectant ad cultum? Resp: sic. Quia imperatur a religione.* A religious reverence, and honour is granted. I but this must be a singular reverence too, and that in relation to God, *Honor enim ille qui deo debetur non potest illi debito modo exhiberi, nisi cum singulari reverentiâ tractentur ejus instrumenta;* and §. 2. *propter arctam illam connexionem, et relationem, quæ inter actum aliquem, et instrumenta actus intercedit.* How farre short this falls of the former, if it be driven home to its utmost issue, and bolted to the Bren[o], I ken not: doe you judge.

If you aske when, at what tymes, or parts of service these adorations are to be done? I answer, they are to be done *pro more Ecclesiæ*

——— *consilium resque locusque dabunt.*

But yet more determinately. Meethinks the analogy, or exigence of the thing it selfe requires, that it be done *in accessu, et recessu* alwayes. For the accesse wee have a direction I thinke in Scripture. Micah

[m] [i. e. 'construe.']

[n] [p. 182. 4to. Amstel. 1630.—'An et quatenus religiosa reverentia deferenda sit,' &c. 'Resp. i. Reverentia, vel honor, triplici sensu vocatur religiosus: vel quia elicitur a religione, . . vel tantum quia imperatur a religione,' &c.]

[o] [i. e. 'sifted to the bran.' See Richardson's Dictionary, 'Bolt.']

6. 6. Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow my selfe before the high God? And consider whether our church in her invitatory to the morning office does not intimate as much, O come let us worship, and bow downe, and kneele before the Lord our maker. psal: 95. according to the last translation[p]: and the title of the psalme in the latin Bibles, is *Venite adoremus.* For the recesse we have a fayre precedent for it in holy Scripture too. 2. Chron: 29. 29. Hezekiah and his company, when they had made an end of offering bowed themselves, and worshipped. *Vade tu, et fac similitèr.*

The Heathen also did so in their sacred rites.

Will you to this give me leave to adde the practice of the Heathen? Theres no hurt in it, for they having not the law yet by nature doing the things contained in the law became a law unto themselves. I argue not from hence, because they doe it, therefore wee Christians must. But this. It is our duty by the law of Christendome, and of all religions, and nature it selfe, as appeares by the practise of heathen people, and let not us be more rude in our addresses to God then they that know him not, least our familiar knowing him intrench too much upon contempt.

Intramus compositi, ad sacrificium accessuri vultum submittimus, togam adducimus, in omne argumentum modestiæ fingimur. saith Seneca. l. 7. c. 30. *Natur: Qq.*[q] And Apuleius saith that Merentius[r] was an Atheist, *eò quod si fanum aliquod prætereat, nefas habet, adorandi gratiâ manum labris admovere. apolog:* 1. p. 181[s]. Kissing the hand was as much reverence with them, as bowing the knee with us.

Ut templi tetigere gradus, procumbit uterque
Pronus humi, gelidoque pavens dedit oscula saxo.

saith Ovid[t] of Deucalion, and Pyrrha, speaking of them *pro more patriæ religionis.* And Justin Martyr p. 95. edit: Paris[u]: saith that the Gentiles when they came to worship were commanded ἀπολύεσθαι, to be discalceate: it may bee they learnd it from Pythagoras, who was a great Doctor of the Gentile rites: ἀνυπόδητος θύει, καὶ προσκύνει. *apud Jamblic: protrept:* 21.[x] ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν θεῶν μετά τινος τιμῆς, καὶ ὁσιότητος σεβόμενος, saith Julian of somebody *in fragmento.* p. 537[y]. Of this I will make the use that S. Chrysostom does homil: 24. in 1 Cor:[z] Ἄνδρες ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ βάρβαροι τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀφέντες, καὶ ἐλθόντες μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου πολλοῦ προσεκύνησαν. Μιμησώμεθα τοίνυν κἂν τοὺς βαρβάρους ἡμεῖς οἱ τῶν οὐρανῶν πολῖται. It is no shame beleive it for us who are intitled heires of Heaven by promise to imitate so pious practises even of barbarous, and heathen people.

[p] [scil. 1611.]
[q] [tom. ii. p. 840.]
[r] [leg. 'Mezentius.']
[s] [tom. ii. p. 519. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1823.]
[t] [Metam. i. 375.]
[u] [ed. Morell. In Apol. ii.]
[x] [p. 132. 4to. 1598.]
[y] [al. p. 293.]
[z] [§ 5. tom. x. p. 218 B.]

Shall I end my discourse with the testimony of Bishop Jewell? art: 3. divis: 29.[a] of his reply to Harding? Kneeling, 'bowing,' standing up, and other like are commendable gestures, and tokens of devotion, so long as the people understandeth what they meane, and applyeth them to God, to whom they are due. This is fayre; it is no will-worship then for it is lawful at least: but because my premises inferre more I had rather conclude with the words of S. Austin in Psal: 98[b]. *Non solum non peccamus adorando, sed peccamus non adorando.* I will but adde the saying of Venerable Bede[c] concerning an irreligious person though a professor of Religion, but one that was too rude in his addresses to God in the Church, *Unde accidit illi, quod solent dicere quidam* (it seemes it was a proverbe in those dayes, that's 900 years agoe) *Qui non vult Ecclesiæ januam sponte humiliatus ingredi, necesse habet in januam inferni non sponte damnatus introduci.* lib. 5. hist: cap. 15.

[a] [p. 150. fol. Lond. 1609.] [b] [ver. 5. tom. iv. col. 1065 D.]
[c] [tom. iii. col. 131.]

ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ 'ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΗ,

OR,

A DISCOURSE

OF

THE LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING,

WITH

ITS JUST LIMITS AND TEMPER:

SHEWING

THE UNREASONABLENESS OF PRESCRIBING TO OTHER MEN'S FAITH, AND THE INIQUITY OF PERSECUTING DIFFERING OPINIONS.

Δύνασθε γὰρ καθ' ἕνα πάντες προφητεύειν. 1 Cor. xiv. 31.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

CHRISTOPHER LORD HATTON,

BARON HATTON OF KIRBY, COMPTROLLER OF HIS MAJESTY'S HOUSEHOLD, AND ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL.

My lord,

In this great storm which hath dashed the vessel of the church all in pieces, I have been cast upon the coast of Wales, and in a little boat thought to have enjoyed that rest and quietness which in England in a greater I could not hope for. Here I cast anchor, and thinking to ride safely, the storm followed me with so impetuous violence, that it broke a cable, and I lost my anchor; and here again I was exposed to the mercy of the sea, and the gentleness of an element that could neither distinguish things nor persons. And but that He who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of His waves, and the madness of His people, had provided a plank for me, I had been lost to all the opportunities of content or study. But I know not whether I have been more preserved by the courtesies of my friends, or the gentleness and mercies of a noble enemy: Οἱ γὰρ βάρβαροι παρεῖχον οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν· ἀνάψαντες γὰρ πυρὰν, προσελάβοντο πάντας ἡμᾶς, διὰ τὸν ὑετὸν τὸν ἐφεστῶτα, καὶ διὰ τὸ ψύχος[a]. And now since I have come ashore, I have been gathering a few sticks to warm me, a few books to entertain my thoughts, and divert them from the perpetual meditation of my private troubles and the public dyscrasy: but those which I could obtain were so few, and so impertinent and unuseful to any great purposes, that I began to be sad upon a new stock, and full of apprehension that I should live unprofitably, and die obscurely, and be forgotten, and my bones thrown into some common charnel-house, without any name or note to distinguish me from those who only served their generation by filling the number of citizens, and who could pretend to no thanks or reward from the public, beyond a *jus trium liberorum*. While I was troubled with these thoughts, and busy to find out an opportunity of doing some good in my small proportion, still the cares

[a] [Acts xxviii. 2.]

of the public did so intervene, that it was as impossible to separate my design from relating to the present as to exempt myself from the participation of the common calamity; still half my thoughts was (in despite of all my diversions and arts of avocation) fixed upon and mingled with the present concernments; so that besides them I could not go. (Now because the great question is concerning religion, and in that also my scene lies, I resolved here to fix my considerations; especially when I observed the ways of promoting the several opinions which now are busy, to be such as, besides that they were most troublesome to me and such as I could by no means be friends withal, they were also such as to my understanding did the most apparently disserve their ends whose design in advancing their own opinions was pretended for religion.) (For as contrary as cruelty is to mercy, as tyranny to charity, so is war and bloodshed to the meekness and gentleness of christian religion.) And however that there are some exterminating spirits who think God to delight in human sacrifices, as if that oracle,

Καὶ κεφαλὰς ἔδη καὶ τῷ πατρὶ πέμπετε φῶτα[b],

had come from the Father of spirits: yet if they were capable of cool and tame homilies, or would hear men of other opinions give a quiet account without invincible resolutions never to alter their persuasions, I am very much persuaded it would not be very hard to dispute such men into mercies, and compliances, and tolerations mutual, such, I say, who are zealous for Jesus Christ, than whose doctrine never was any thing more merciful and humane, whose lessons were softer than nard or the juice of the Candian olive. Upon the first apprehension I designed a discourse to this purpose, with as much greediness as if I had thought it possible with my arguments to have persuaded the rough and hard-handed soldiers to have disbanded presently: for I had often thought of the prophecy that in the gospel 'our swords should be turned into plow-shares, and our spears into pruning-hooks[c];' I knew that no tittle spoken by God's spirit could return unperformed and ineffectual; and I was certain that such was the excellency of Christ's doctrine, that if men could obey it, Christians should never war one against another: in the mean time I considered not that it was *prædictio consilii, non eventus*, till I saw what men were now doing, and ever had done since the heats and primitive fervours did cool, and the love of interests swelled higher than the love of christianity. But then on the other side I began to fear that whatever I could say would be as ineffectual as it could be reasonable: for if those excellent words which our blessed Master spake could not charm the tumult of our spirits, I had little reason to hope that one of the meanest and most ignorant of His servants could advance the end of that which he calls His 'great,' and His 'old,' and His 'new commandment,' so well as the excellency of His own Spirit

[b] [Macrob. Saturn. i. 7. p. 240.]

[c] [Is. ii. 4; Mic. iv. 3.]

and discourses could. And yet since He who knew every event of things, and the success and efficacy of every doctrine, and that very much of it to most men, and all of it to some men, would be ineffectual, yet was pleased to consign our duty, that it might be a direction to them that would, and a conviction and a testimony against them that would not obey; I thought it might not misbecome my duty and endeavours to plead for peace and charity, and forgiveness and permissions mutual: although I had reason to believe that such is the iniquity of men, and they so indisposed to receive such impresses, that I had as good plow the sands or till the air, as persuade such doctrines which destroy men's interests, and serve no end but the great end of a happy eternity and what is in order to it. But because the events of things are in God's disposition and I knew them not, and because if I had known, my good purposes would be totally ineffectual as to others, yet my own designation and purposes would be of advantage to myself, who might from God's mercy expect the retribution which He is pleased to promise to all pious intendments; I resolved to encounter with all objections, and to do something to which I should be determined by the consideration of the present distemperatures and necessities, by my own thoughts, by the questions and scruples, the sects and names, the interests and animosities, which at this day and for some years past have exercised and disquieted christendom.

Thus far I discoursed myself into employment, and having come thus far I knew not how to get further; for I had heard of a great experience how difficult it was to make brick without straw: and here I had even seen my design blasted in the bud, and I despaired in the Calends of doing what I purposed in the Ides before. For I had no books of my own here nor any in the voisinage, and but that I remembered the result of some of those excellent discourses I had heard your Lordship make when I was so happy as in private to gather up what your temperance and modesty forbids to be public, I had come *in prælia inermis*, and like enough might have fared accordingly. I had this only advantage besides, that I have chosen a subject in which, if my own reason does not abuse me, I needed no other books or aids than what a man carries with him on horseback, I mean the common principles of christianity, and those ἀξιώματα which men use in the transactions of the ordinary occurrences of civil society: and upon the strength of them, and some other collateral assistances, I have run through it *utcunque;* and the sum of the following discourses is nothing but the sense of these words of scripture[d]; that since "we know in part and prophesy in part," and that "now we see through a glass darkly," we should not despise or contemn persons not so knowing as ourselves, but 'him that is weak in the faith, we should receive, but not to doubtful disputations[e],' therefore certainly to charity, and not to vexations, not to those which are the

[d] [1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12.] [e] [Rom. xiv. 1.]

idle effects of impertinent wranglings. And provided they keep close to the foundation, which is faith and obedience, let them build upon this foundation matter more or less precious, yet if the foundation be entire, they shall be saved with or without loss. And since we profess ourselves servants of so meek a Master and disciples of so charitable an institute, "Let us walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love[f];" for this is the best "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit," when it is fast tied "in the bond of peace." And although it be a duty of christianity that "we all speak the same thing, that there be no divisions among us, but that we be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment[g];" yet this unity is to be estimated according to the unity of faith, in things necessary, in matters of creed, and articles fundamental; for as for other things, it is more to be wished than to be hoped for. There are some 'doubtful disputations,' and in such 'the scribe, the wise, the disputer of this world[h],' are most commonly very far from certainty, and many times from truth. There are diversity of persuasions in matters adiaphorous, as meats, and drinks, and holy days, &c., and both parties, the affirmative and the negative, affirm and deny with innocence enough; for the observer, and he that observes not, intend both to God; and God is our common Master, we are all fellow-servants, and not the judge of each other in matters of conscience or doubtful disputation; and every man that 'hath faith, must have it to himself before God[i],' but no man must either in such matters 'judge his brother or set him at nought:' but 'let us follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.' And the way to do that is not by knowledge, but by charity; for "knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth[j]." And since 'there is not in every man the same knowledge, but the conscience of some are weak[k];' as 'my liberty must not be judged of another man's weak conscience[l],' so must not I please myself so much in my right opinion but I must also take order that his 'weak conscience be not offended or despised:' for no man must 'seek his own, but every man another's wealth[m].' And although we must 'contend earnestly for the faith[n],' yet 'above all things we must put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness[o].' And therefore this contention must be with arms fit for the christian warfare, "the sword of the Spirit, and the shield of faith, and preparation of the gospel of peace instead of shoes, and a helmet of salvation[p]." But not with other arms; for a churchman must not be πλητικὸς[q], 'a striker;' for 'the weapons of our warfare are not carnal' but spiri-

[f] [Eph. iv. 2, 3.]
[g] [1 Cor. i. 10.]
[h] [1 Cor. i. 20.]
[i] [Rom. xiv. 22, 10, 19.]
[j] [1 Cor. viii. 1.]
[k] [ver. 7.]
[l] [1 Cor. x. 29.]
[m] [ver. 24.]
[n] [Jude 3.]
[o] [Col. iii. 14.]
[p] [Eph. vi. 15 sq.]
[q] [vid. 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. i. 7.]

tual[r], and the persons that use them ought to be "gentle, and easy to be entreated[s];" and we 'must give an account of our faith to them that ask us, with meekness and humility,' "for so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men[t]." These and thousands more to the same purpose are the doctrines of christianity, whose sense and intendment I have prosecuted in the following discourse, being very much displeased that so many opinions and new doctrines are commenced among us, but more troubled that every man that hath an opinion thinks his own and other men's salvation is concerned in its maintenance, but most of all that men should be persecuted and afflicted for disagreeing in such opinions which they cannot with sufficient grounds obtrude upon others necessarily, because they cannot propound them infallibly, and because they have no warrant from scripture so to do. For if I shall tie other men to believe my opinion because I think I have a place of scripture which seems to warrant it to my understanding, why may he not serve up another dish to me in the same dress, and exact the same task of me to believe the contradictory? And then, since all the heretics in the world have offered to prove their articles by the same means by which true believers propound theirs, it is necessary that some separation either of doctrine or of persons be clearly made, and that all pretences may not be admitted, nor any just allegations be rejected; and yet that in some other questions, whether they be truly or falsely pretended, if not evidently or demonstratively, there may be considerations had to the persons of men and to the laws of charity, more than to the triumphing in any opinion or doctrine not simply necessary. Now because some doctrines are clearly not necessary, and some are absolutely necessary, why may not the first separation be made upon this difference, and articles necessary be only urged as necessary, and the rest left to men indifferently as they were by the scripture indeterminately? And it were well if men would as much consider themselves as the doctrines, and think that they may as well be deceived by their own weakness as persuaded by the arguments of a doctrine which other men, as wise, call inevident. For it is a hard case that we should think all papists, and anabaptists, and sacramentaries, to be fools and wicked persons: certainly among all these sects there are very many wise men and good men, as well as erring. And although some zeals are so hot and their eyes so inflamed with their ardours that they do not think their adversaries look like other men, yet certainly we find by the results of their discourses and the transactions of their affairs of civil society, that they are men that speak and make syllogisms, and use reason, and read scripture: and although they do no more understand all of it than we do, yet they endeavour to understand as much as concerns them, even all that they can, even all that concerns repentance from dead works and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. And therefore methinks

[r] [vid. 2 Cor. x. 4.] [s] [James iii. 17.] [t] [1 Pet. iii. 15; ii. 15.]

this also should be another consideration distinguishing the persons; for if the persons be Christians in their lives and Christians in their profession, if they acknowledge the eternal Son of God for their Master and their Lord, and live in all relations as becomes persons making such professions, why then should I hate such persons whom God loves and who love God, who are partakers of Christ and Christ hath a title to them, who dwell in Christ and Christ in them, because their understandings have not been brought up like mine, have not had the same masters, they have not met with the same books nor the same company, or have not the same interest, or are not so wise, or else are wiser; that is, for some reason or other which I neither do understand nor ought to blame, have not the same opinions that I have, and do not determine their school-questions to the sense of my sect or interest?

But now I know beforehand that those men who will endure none but their own sect will make all manner of attempts against these purposes of charity and compliance, and, say I or do I what I can, will tell all their proselytes that I preach indifferency of religion; that I say it is no matter how we believe nor what they profess, but that they may comply with all sects and do violence to their own consciences; that they may be saved in all religions; and so make way for a *colluvies* of heresies, and by consequence destroy all religion. Nay, they will say worse than all this; and, but that I am not used to their phrases and forms of declamation, I am persuaded I might represent fine tragedies beforehand. And this will be such an objection, that although I am most confident I shall make it[u] apparent to be as false and scandalous as the objectors themselves are zealous and impatient; yet besides that I believe the objection will come where my answers will not come, or not be understood, I am also confident that in defiance and incuriousness of all that I shall say, some men will persist pertinaciously in the accusation, and deny my conclusion in despite of me. Well, but however I will try; and,

First I answer, that whatsoever is against the foundation of faith, or contrary to good life and the laws of obedience, or destructive to human society and the public and just interests of bodies politic, is out of the limits of my question, and does not pretend to compliance or toleration: so that I allow no indifferency, nor any countenance to those religions whose principles destroy government, nor to those religions (if there be any such) that teach ill life; nor do I think that any thing will now excuse from belief of a fundamental article, except stupidity or sottishness and natural inability. This alone is sufficient answer to this vanity; but I have much more to say.

Secondly, the intendment of my discourse is, that permissions should be in questions speculative, indeterminable, curious, and unnecessary; and that men would not make more necessities than God made, which indeed are not many. The fault I find, and seek to

[u] ['it' om. A, B.]

remedy, is that men are so dogmatical and resolute in their opinions and impatient of others' disagreeings, in those things wherein is no sufficient means of union and determination; but that men should let opinions and problems keep their own forms and not be obtruded as axioms, nor questions in the vast collection of the system of divinity be adopted into the family of faith. And I think I have reason to desire this.

Thirdly, it is hard to say that he who would not have men put to death, or punished corporally, for such things for which no human authority is sufficient either for cognizance or determination, or competent for infliction, that he persuades to an indifferency when he refers to another judicatory which is competent, sufficient, infallible, just, and highly severe. No man or company of men can judge or punish our thoughts or secret purposes, whilst they so remain. And yet it will be unequal to say that he who owns this doctrine preaches it lawful to men to think or purpose what they will. And so it is in matters of doubtful disputation, such as are the distinguishing articles of most of the sects of christendom; so it is in matters intellectual, which are not cognoscible by a secular power; in matters spiritual, which are to be discerned by spiritual authority, which cannot make corporal inflictions; and in questions indeterminate, which are doubtfully propounded or obscurely, and therefore may be *in utramque partem* disputed or believed. For God alone must be Judge of these matters, who alone is Master of our souls, and hath a dominion over human understanding; and he that says this does not say that indifferency is persuaded, because God alone is Judge of erring persons.

Fourthly, no part of this discourse teaches or encourages variety of sects and contradiction in opinions, but supposes them already in being: and therefore since there are and ever were and ever will be, variety of opinions, because there is variety of human understandings and uncertainty in things, no man should be too forward in determining all questions, nor so forward in prescribing to others, nor invade that liberty which God hath left to us entire, by propounding many things obscurely, and by exempting our souls and understandings from all power externally compulsory. So that the restraint is laid upon men's tyranny, but no license given to men's opinions; they are not considered in any of the conclusions, but in the premises only, as an argument to exhort to charity. So that if I persuade a license of discrediting any thing which God hath commanded us to believe, and allow a liberty where God hath not allowed it, let it be shewn, and let the objection press as hard as it can: but to say that men are too forward in condemning where God hath declared no sentence nor prescribed any rule, is to dissuade from tyranny, not to encourage licentiousness; is to take away a license of judging, not to give a license of dogmatizing what every one please, or as may best serve his turn. And for the other part of the objection;

Fifthly, this discourse is so far from giving leave to men to profess any thing though they believe the contrary, that it takes order that no man shall be put to it, for I earnestly contend that another man's opinion shall be no rule to mine, and that my opinion shall be no snare and prejudice to myself; that men use one another so charitably and so gently that no error or violence tempt men to hypocrisy; this very thing being one of the arguments I use to persuade permissions, lest compulsion introduce hypocrisy, and make sincerity troublesome and unsafe.

Sixthly, if men would not call all opinions by the name of religion, and superstructures by the name of fundamental articles, and all fancies by the glorious appellative of faith, this objection would have no pretence or footing: so that it is the disease of the men, not any cause that is ministered by such precepts of charity, that makes them perpetually clamorous. And it would be hard to say that such physicians are incurious of their patients and neglectful of their health, who speak against the unreasonableness of such empirics that would cut off a man's head if they see but a wart upon his cheek, or a dimple upon his chin, or any lines in his face to distinguish him from another man: the case is altogether the same, and we may as well decree a wart to be mortal, as a various opinion, *in re alioqui non necessaria,* to be capital and damnable.

For I consider that there are but few doctrines of christianity that were ordered to be preached to all the world, to every single person, and made a necessary article of his explicit belief. Other doctrines. which are all of them not simply necessary, are either such as are not clearly revealed, or such as are. If they be clearly revealed, and that I know so too, or may but for my own fault, I am not to be excused: but for this I am to be left to God's judgment, unless my fault be externally such as to be cognoscible and punishable in human judicatory. But then if it be not so revealed but that wise men and good men differ in their opinions, it is a clear case it is not *inter dogmata necessaria simpliciter;* and then it is certain I may therefore safely disbelieve it, because I may be safely ignorant of it. For if I may with innocence be ignorant, then to know it or believe it is not simply obligatory: ignorance is absolutely inconsistent with such an obligation, because it is destructive and a plain negative to its performance; and if I do my honest endeavour to understand it and yet do not attain it, it is certain that it is not obligatory to me so much as by accident; for no obligation can press the person of a man if it be impossible; no man is bound to do more than his best, no man is bound to have an excellent understanding, or to be infallible, or to be wiser than he can; for these are things that are not in his choice, and therefore not a matter of a law, nor subject to reward and punishment. So that where ignorance of the article is not a sin, there disbelieving it in the right sense, or believing it in the wrong, is not a breach of any duty essentially or accidentally necessary, either in the

thing itself or to the person; that is, he is neither bound to the article, nor to any endeavours or antecedent acts of volition and choice; and that man who may safely be ignorant of the proposition, is not tied at all to search it out; and if not at all to search it, then certainly not to find it. All the obligation we are capable of is, not to be malicious or voluntarily criminal in any kind; and then if by accident we find out a truth, we are obliged to believe it; and so will every wise or good man do, indeed he cannot do otherwise. But if he disbelieves an article without malice or design, or involuntarily or unknowingly, it is contradiction to say it is a sin to him who might totally have been ignorant of it: for that he believes it in the wrong sense, it is his ignorance; and it is impossible that where he hath heartily endeavoured to find out a truth, that this endeavour should make him guilty of a sin which would never have been laid to his charge if he had taken no pains at all. His ignorance in this case is not a fault at all; possibly it might if there had been no endeavour to have cured it.

So that there is wholly a mistake in this proposition. For true it is, there are some propositions which if a man never hear of they will not be required of him; and they who cannot read might safely be ignorant that Melchisedec was king of Salem: but he who reads it in the scripture may not safely contradict it, although before that knowledge did arrive to him he might safely have been ignorant of it. But this although it be true is not pertinent to our question: for *in sensu diviso* this is true; that which at one time a man may be ignorant of, at some other time he may not disbelieve; but *in sensu conjuncto* it is false; for at what time and in what circumstance soever it is no sin to be ignorant, at that time and in that conjuncture it is no sin to disbelieve. And such is the nature of all questions disputable, which are therefore not required of us to be believed in any one particular sense, because the nature of the thing is such as not to be necessary to be known at all simply and absolutely; and such is the ambiguity and cloud of its face and representment as not to be necessary so much as by accident, and therefore not to the particular sense of any one person.

And yet such is the iniquity of men that they suck in opinions as wild asses do the wind, without distinguishing the wholesome from the corrupted air, and then live upon it at a venture; and when all their confidence is built upon zeal and mistake, yet therefore because they are zealous and mistaken, they are impatient of contradiction.

But besides that against this I have laid prejudice enough from the dictates of holy scripture, it is observable that this, with its appendent degrees, I mean restraint of prophesying, imposing upon other men's understanding, being masters of their consciences and lording it over their faith, came in with the retinue and train of Antichrist; that is, they came as other abuses and corruptions of the church did, by reason of the iniquity of times, and the cooling of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

first heats of christianity, and the increase of interest, and the abatements of christian simplicity, when the church's fortune grew better, and her sons grew worse, and some of her fathers worst of all. For in the first three hundred years there was no sign of persecuting any man for his opinion, though at that time there were very horrid opinions commenced, and such which were exemplary and parallel enough to determine this question; for they then were assaulted by new sects, which destroyed the common principles of nature, or christianity, of innocence, and public society; and they who used all the means christian and spiritual for their disimprovement and conviction, thought not of using corporal force otherwise than by blaming such proceedings. And therefore I do not only urge their not doing it as an argument of the unlawfulness of such proceeding, but their defying it and speaking against such practices as unreasonable and destructive of christianity. For so Tertullian[v] is express, *Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique quod putaverit colere; . . sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi.* The same is the doctrine of S. Cyprian, Lactantius, S. Hilary, Minutius Felix, Sulpitius Severus, S. Chrysostom, S. Hierome, S. Austin, Damascene, Theophylact, Socrates Scholasticus, and S. Bernard, as they are severally referred to and urged, upon occasion, in the following discourse.

To which I add, that all wise princes, till they were overborne with faction or solicited by peevish persons, gave toleration to differing sects whose opinions did not disturb the public interest. But at first there were some heretical persons that were also impatient of an adversary, and they were the men who at first entreated the emperors to persecute the catholics: but till four hundred years after Christ, no catholic persons, or very few, did provoke the secular arm, or implore its aid against the heretics, save only that Arius behaved himself so seditiously and tumultuarily that the Nicene fathers procured a temporary decree for his relegation; but it was soon taken off, and God left to be his judge; who indeed did it to some purpose, when He was trusted with it, and the matter wholly left to Him.

But as the ages grew worse, so men grew more cruel and unchristian: and in the Greek church, Atticus, and Nestorius of Constantinople, Theodosius of Synada, and some few others, who had forgotten the mercies of their great Master and their own duty, grew implacable, and furious, and impatient of contradiction. It was a bold and an arrogant speech which Nestorius[w] made in his sermon before Theodosius the younger, *Da mihi, O imperator, terram ab hæreticis repurgatam, et ego tibi vicissim cœlum dabo: disperde mecum hæreticos, et ego tecum disperdam Persas.* It was as groundless and unwarrantable as it was bloody and inhuman.

[v] Ad Scapul. [cap. ii. p. 69 A.]
[w] [Cassiod. (post Socr. vii. 29.) hist. tripart. xii. 4. p. 375.]

And we see the contrary events prove truer than this groundless and unlearned promise: for Theodosius and Valentinian were prosperous princes, and have to all ages a precious memory, and the reputation of a great piety; but they were so far from doing what Nestorius had suggested that they restrained him from his violence and immanity; and Theodosius[x] did highly commend the good bishop Proclus for his sweetness of deportment towards erring persons, far above the cruelty of his predecessor Atticus. And the experience which christendom hath had in this last age is argument enough that toleration of differing opinions is so far from disturbing the public peace or destroying the interest of princes and commonwealths, that it does advantage to the public, it secures peace, because there is not so much as the pretence of religion left to such persons to contend for it, being already indulged to them. When France fought against the Huguenots, the spilling of her own blood was argument enough of the imprudence of that way of promoting religion; but since she hath given permission to them, the world is witness how prosperous she hath been ever since. But the great instance is in the differing temper, government, and success, which Margaret of Parma and the duke of Alva had. The clemency of the first had almost extinguished the flame: but when she was removed, D'Alva succeeded, and managed the matter of religion with fire and sword; he made the flame so great that his religion and his prince too have[y] both been almost quite turned out of the country. *Pelli e medio sapientiam, quoties vi res agitur,* saith Ennius[z]: and therefore the best of men and the most glorious of princes were always ready to give toleration, but never to make executions for matters disputable. Eusebius, in his second book of the life of Constantine[a], reports these words of the emperor, *Parem cum fidelibus ii qui errant pacis et quietis fruitionem gaudentes accipiant: ipsa siquidem communicationis et societatis restitutio ad rectam etiam veritatis viam perducere potest. Nemo cuiquam molestus sit: quisque quod animo destinat, hoc etiam faciat.*

And indeed there is great reason for princes to give toleration to disagreeing persons whose opinions by fair means cannot be altered. For if the persons be confident, they will serve God according to their persuasions; and if they be publicly prohibited, they will privately convene: and then all those inconveniences and mischiefs which are arguments against the permission of conventicles, are arguments for the public permissions of differing religions, because the denying of the public worship will certainly produce private conventicles, against which all wise princes and commonwealths have upon great reasons made edicts and severe sanctions. *Quicquid enim*

[x] [Socr. vii. 42.]

[y] ['hath,' A, B.]

[z] ['Pellitur e medio sapientia; vi geritur res.' Enn. apud Aul. Gell. xx. 9.—Vid. etiam Cic. pro Murœn. § 14. tom. v. p. 215.]

[a] [cap. lvi. p. 563.]

agitur absente rege, in caput ejus plerumque redundat, say the politics. For the face of a man is as the face of a lion, and scatters all base machinations, which breathe not but in the dark. It is a proverbial saying, *Quod nimia familiaritas servorum est conspiratio adversus Dominum:* and they who for their security run into grots, and cellars, and retirements, think that, they being upon the defensive, those princes and those laws that drive them to it are their enemies, and therefore they cannot be secure unless the power of the one and the obligation of the other be lessened and rescinded; and then the being restrained and made miserable, endears the discontented persons mutually, and makes more hearty and dangerous confederations. King James of blessed memory in his letters to the States of the United Provinces, dated 6th March, 1613, thus wrote[b], *Magis autem e re fore si sopiantur autoritate publica, ita ut prohibeatis ministros vestros ne eas disputationes in suggestum aut ad plebem ferant; ac districte imperetis ut pacem colant, se invicem tolerando in ista opinionum ac sententiarum discrepantia. . . Eoque justius videmur vobis hoc ipsum suadere debere, quod . . neutram comperimus adeo deviam ut non possit et cum fidei christianæ veritate et cum animarum salute consistere, &c.* The like counsel in the divisions of Germany[c] at the first reformation was thought reasonable by the emperor Ferdinand and his excellent son Maximilian: for they had observed that violence did exasperate, was unblessed, unsuccessful, and unreasonable; and therefore they made decrees of toleration, and appointed tempers and expedients to be drawn up by discreet persons; and George Cassander was designed to this great work, and did something towards it. And Emanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy[d], repenting of his war undertaken for religion against the Pedemontans, promised them toleration, and was as good as his word. As much is done by the nobility of Polonia. So that the best princes and the best bishops gave toleration and impunities: but it is known that the first persecutions of disagreeing persons were by the Arrians, by the Circumcellians and Donatists; and from them they of the church took examples, who in small numbers did sometime persuade it, sometime practise it. And among the Greeks it became a public and authorized practice, till the question of images grew hot and high: for then the worshippers of images, having taken their example from the empress Irene[e] who put her son's eyes out for making an edict against images, began to be as cruel as they were deceived; especially being encouraged by the popes of Rome, who then blew the coals to some purpose.

[b] [This letter appears to have been originally in French, as given in 'Præstantium ac eruditorum virorum epistolæ ecclesiasticæ et theologicæ,' p. 393. 8vo. Amsterd. 1660. Grotius introduces the same passage of the letter, though differently rendered into latin, in his 'Apologeticus,' &c. p. 101. 8vo. Par. 1622.]

[c] [Thuan. xxxvi. 15. tom. ii. p. 397.]

[d] [Guichenon, 'Hist. genealogique,' &c., p. 665.]

[e] [Cedren., p. 374.]

And that I may upon this occasion give account of this affair in the church of Rome, it is remarkable that till the time of Justinian the emperor, A.D. 525, the Catholics and Novatians had churches indifferently permitted even in Rome itself; but the bishops of Rome, whose interest was much concerned in it, spoke much against it, and laboured the eradication of the Novatians, and at last, when they got power into their hands, they served them accordingly: but it is observed by Socrates[f], that when the first persecution was made against them at Rome by pope Innocent I., at the same instant the Goths invaded Italy, and became lords of all; it being just in God to bring a persecution upon them for true belief, who, with an incompetent authority and insufficient grounds, do persecute an error less material, in persons agreeing with them in the profession of the same common faith. And I have heard it observed[g] as a blessing upon S. Austin (who was so merciful to erring persons as the greatest part of his life in all senses, even when he had twice changed his mind, yet to tolerate them, and never to endure they should be given over to the secular power to be killed) that the very night the Vandals set down before his city of Hippo to besiege it, he died and went to God, being, as a reward of his merciful doctrine, taken from the miseries to come. And yet that very thing was also a particular issue of the divine providence upon that city, who not long before had altered their profession into truth by force, and now were falling into their power, who afterward by a greater force turned them to be Arians.

But in the church of Rome the popes were the first preachers of force and violence in matters of opinion, and that so zealously that pope Vigilius[h] suffered himself to be imprisoned and handled roughly by the emperor Justinian rather than he would consent to the restitution and peace of certain disagreeing persons. But as yet it came not so far as death. The first that preached that doctrine was Dominic[i], the founder of the begging orders of friars, the friars-preachers; in memory of which the Inquisition is entrusted only to the friars of his order. And if there be any force in dreams or truth in legends (as there is not much in either) this very thing might be signified by his mother's dream, who the night before Dominic was born dreamed she was brought to bed of a huge dog with a fire-brand in his mouth. Sure enough, however his disciples expound the dream, it was a better sign that he should prove a rabid, furious incendiary than any thing else: whatever he might be in the other parts of his life, in this[k] doctrine he was not much better, as appears in his deportment toward the Albigenses, against whom he so preached, *adeo quidem ut centum hæreticorum millia ab octo millibus catholicorum fusa et interfecta fuisse perhibeantur*, saith one of him; and of those who were taken, a hundred and eighty were burnt to death because they

[f] [H. E. vii. 9 sq.]
[g] [Possid. in vit. S. Aug., cap. xxix.]
[h] [Niceph. xvii. 26.]
[i] [Baillet, Vie des Saints, in Aug. iv. tom. ii. col. 45.]
[k] ['his,' G.]

would not abjure their doctrine[l]. This was the first example of putting erring persons to death that I find in the Roman church. For about a hundred and seventy years before, Berengarius fell into opinion concerning the blessed sacrament which they called heresy, and recanted, and relapsed, and recanted again, and fell again two or three times, saith Gerson[m], writing against Romant of the Rose, and yet he died *sicca morte*, 'his own natural death,' and with hope of heaven, and yet Hildebrand was once his judge: which shews that at that time Rome was not come to so great heights of bloodshed. In England, although the pope had as great power here as anywhere, yet there were no executions for matter of opinion known till the time of Henry IV., who, because he usurped the crown, was willing by all means to endear the clergy by destroying their enemies, that so he might be sure of them to all his purposes. And indeed it may become them well enough who are wiser in their generations than the children of light, it may possibly serve the policies of evil persons, but never the pure and chaste designs of christianity, which admits no blood but Christ's, and the imitating blood of martyrs, but knows nothing how to serve her ends by persecuting any of her erring children.

By this time I hope it will not be thought reasonable to say, he that teaches mercy to erring persons teaches indifferency in religion; unless so many fathers, and so many churches, and the best of emperors, and all the world till they were abused by tyranny, popery, and faction, did teach indifferency. For I have shewn that christianity does not punish corporally persons erring spiritually, but indeed popery does; the Donatists, and Circumcellians, and Arians, and the Itaciani, they of old did: in the middle ages the patrons of images did, and the papists at this day do, and have done ever since they were taught it by their S. Dominic.

Seventhly; And yet after all this, I have something more to exempt myself from the clamour of this objection. For let all errors be as much and as zealously suppressed as may be (the doctrine of the following discourse contradicts not that;) but let it be done by such means as are proper instruments of their suppression, by preaching and disputation (so that neither of them breed disturbance,) by charity and sweetness, by holiness of life, assiduity of exhortation, by the word of God and prayer.

For these ways are most natural, most prudent, most peaceable and effectual. Only let not men be hasty in calling every disliked opinion by the name of heresy; and when they have resolved that they will call it so, let them use the erring person like a brother, not beat him like a dog, or convince him with a gibbet, or vex him out of his understanding and persuasions.

[l] Bruno Berengarianos e sua diœcesi expulit, non morti aut suppliciis corporalibus tradidit.

[m] [Opp. part. iv. p. 927 A. fol. Par. 1606.]

And now if men will still say I persuade to indifferency, there is no help for me, for I have given reasons against it; I must bear it as well as I can; I am not yet without remedy, as they are; for patience will help me, and reason will not cure them; let them take their course, and Ile[n] take mine.

Only I will take leave to consider this, and they would do well to do so too, that unless faith be kept within its own latitude, and not called out to patrocinate every less necessary opinion, and the interest of every sect or peevish person; and if damnation be pronounced against Christians believing the creed and living good lives, because they are deceived, or are said to be deceived, in some opinions less necessary; there is no way in the world to satisfy unlearned persons in the choice of their religion, or to appease the unquietness of a scrupulous conscience. For suppose an honest citizen, whose employment and parts will not enable him to judge the disputes and arguings of great clerks, sees factions commenced and managed with much bitterness by persons who might on either hand be fit enough to guide him; when if he follows either, he is disquieted and pronounced damned by the other (who also if he be the most unreasonable in his opinion will perhaps be more furious in his sentence) what shall this man do, where shall he rest the sole of his foot? Upon the doctrine of the church where he lives? Well, but that he hears declaimed against perpetually, and other churches claim highly and pretend fairly for truth, and condemn his church. If I tell him that he must live a good life and believe the creed, and not trouble himself with their disputes, or interesting[o] himself in sects and factions, I speak reason; because no law of God ties him to believe more than what is of essential necessity, and whatsoever he shall come to know to be revealed by God: Now if he believes his creed, he believes all that is necessary to all, or of itself; and if he do his moral endeavour beside, he can do no more toward finding out all the rest, and then he is secured. But then if this will secure him, why do men press further, and pretend every opinion as necessary, and that in so high a degree that if they all said true, or any two indeed of them, in five hundred sects which are in the world (and for aught I know there may be five thousand) it is five hundred to one but that every man is damned; for every sect damns all but itself, and that is damned of four hundred and ninety-nine, and it is excellent fortune then if that escape. And there is the same reason in every one of them, that is, it is extreme unreasonableness in all of them, to pronounce damnation against such persons, against whom clearly and dogmatically holy scripture hath not. *In odiosis quod minimum est sequimur, in favoribus quod est maximum*, saith the law; and therefore we should say any thing or make any excuse that is in any degree reasonable, rather than condemn all the world to hell; es-

[n] ['I'le,' C.]

[o] ['interest,' C.]

pecially if we consider these two things, that we ourselves are as apt to be deceived as any are, and that they who are deceived when they used their moral industry that they might not be deceived, if they perish for this they perish for what they could not help.

But however, if the best security in the world be not in neglecting all sects and subdivisions of men, and fixing ourselves on points necessary and plain, and on honest and pious endeavour according to our several capacities and opportunities for all the rest; if, I say, all this be not through the mercies of God the best security to all unlearned persons, and learned too, where shall we fix? where shall we either have peace or security? If you bid me follow your doctrine, you must tell me why; and perhaps when you have, I am not able to judge; or if I be as able as other people are, yet when I have judged I may be deceived too, and so may you, or any man else you bid me follow; so that I am no whit the nearer truth or peace.

And then if we look abroad, and consider how there is scarce any church but is highly charged by many adversaries in many things, possibly we may see a reason to charge every one of them in some things; and what shall we do then? The church of Rome hath spots enough, and all the world is inquisitive enough to find out more, and to represent these to her greatest disadvantage. The Greek church denies[p] the procession of the Holy Ghost[q] from the Son. If that be false doctrine, she is highly to blame; if it be not, then all the western churches are to blame for saying the contrary. And there is no church that is in prosperity but alters her doctrine every age, either by bringing in new doctrines or by contradicting her old; which shews that none are satisfied with themselves or with their own confessions. And since all churches believe themselves fallible, that only excepted which all other churches say is most of all deceived, it were strange if in so many articles which make up their several bodies of confessions they had not mistaken every one of them in some thing or other. The Lutheran churches maintain consubstantiation, the Zuinglians are sacramentaries, the Calvinists are fierce in the matters of absolute predetermination, and all these reject episcopacy, which the primitive church would have made no doubt to have called heresy. The Socinians profess a portentous number of strange opinions; they deny the holy Trinity, and the satisfaction of our blessed Saviour: the Anabaptists laugh at Pædo-baptism: the Ethiopian churches are Nestorian. Where then shall we fix our confidence, or join communion? To pitch upon any one of these is to throw the dice, if salvation be to be had only in one of them, and

[p] ['churches deny,' C.]

[q] [Rather, disavows it as an article of the creed; so Taylor himself, Liberty of Prophesying, § v. num. 7.—Pearson (Expos. of Creed, art. viii.) states the point thus;—"Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations did arise in the Western church, till at last the Latins put it into the Constantinopolitan creed; and being admonished by the Greeks of that as of an unlawful addition," &c.]

that every error that by chance hath made a sect, and is distinguished by a name, be damnable.

If this consideration does not deceive me, we have no other help in the midst of these distractions and disunions, but all of us to be united in that common term, which as it does constitute the church in its being such, so it is the medium of the communion of saints, and that is the creed of the apostles; and in all other things an honest endeavour to find out[r] what truths we can, and a charitable and mutual permission to others that disagree from us and our opinions. I am sure this may satisfy us, for it will secure us; but I know not any thing else that will: and no man can be reasonably persuaded or satisfied in any thing else, unless he throws himself upon chance, or absolute predestination, or his own confidence; in every one of which it is two to one at least but he may miscarry.

Thus far I thought I had reason on my side, and I suppose I have made it good upon its proper grounds in the pages following. But then if the result be that men must be permitted in their opinions, and that Christians must not persecute Christians, I have also as much reason to reprove all those oblique arts which are not direct persecutions of men's persons, but they are indirect proceedings, ungentle and unchristian, servants of faction and interest, provocations to zeal and animosities, and destructive of learning and ingenuity. And these are, suppressing all the monuments of their adversaries, forcing them to recant, and burning their books.

For it is a strange industry and an importune diligence that was used by our forefathers; of all those heresies which gave them battle and employment we have absolutely no record or monument, but what themselves who are adversaries have transmitted to us; and we know that adversaries, especially such who observed all opportunities to discredit both the persons and doctrines of the enemy, are not always the best records or witnesses of such transactions. We see it now in this very age, in the present distemperatures, that parties are no good registers of the actions of the adverse side: and if we cannot be confident of the truth of a story now, now I say that it is possible for any man, and likely that the interessed adversary will discover the imposture, it is far more unlikely that after ages should know any other truth but such as serves the ends of the representers. I am sure such things were never taught us by Christ and His apostles: and if we were sure that ourselves spoke truth, or that truth were able to justify herself, it were better if to preserve a doctrine we did not destroy a commandment, and out of zeal pretending to christian religion, lose the glories and rewards of ingenuity and christian simplicity.

[r] Clem. Alex. stromat. 1. [vid. cap. 9. p. 342.] ait philosophiam liberam esse præstantissimam, quæ scilicet versatur in perspicaciter seligendis dogmatis omnium sectarum. Potamo Alexandrinus sic primus philosophatus est, ut ait Laertius in procœmio [ad fin. tom. i. p. 12], unde cognominatus est ἐκλεξάμενος, scilicet, τὰ ἀρέσαντα ἐξ ἑκάστης τῶν αἱρέσεων.

Of the same consideration is mending of authors not to their own mind but to ours, that is, to mend them so as to spoil them; forbidding the publication of books in which there is nothing impious or against the public interest, leaving out clauses in translations, disgracing men's persons, charging disavowed doctrines upon men, and the persons of the men with the consequents of their doctrine, which they deny either to be true or to be consequent; false reporting of disputations and conferences, burning books by the hand of the hangman, and all such arts which shew that we either distrust God for the maintenance of His truth, or that we distrust the cause, or distrust ourselves and our abilities. I will say no more of these, but only concerning the last I shall transcribe a passage out of Tacitus in the life of Julius Agricola[s], who gives this account of it, *Veniam non petissem, ni cursaturus tam sæva et infesta virtutibus tempora. Legimus, quum Aruleno Rustico Pætus Thrasea, Herennio Senecioni Priscus Helvidius laudati essent, capitale fuisse: neque in ipsos modo auctores, sed in libros quoque eorum sævitum, delegato Triumviris ministerio ut monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur. Scilicet illo igne vocem populi Romani, et libertatem senatus, et conscientiam generis humani aboleri arbitrabantur, expulsis insuper sapientiæ professoribus, atque omni bona arte in exsilium acta, ne quid usquam honestum occurreret.* It is but an illiterate policy to think that such indirect and uningenuous proceedings can among wise and free men disgrace the authors and disrepute their discourses; and I have seen that the price hath been trebled upon a forbidden or a condemned book; and some men in policy have got a prohibition, that their impression might be the more certainly vendible, and the author himself thought considerable.

The best way is to leave tricks and devices, and to fall upon that way which the best ages of the church did use: with the strength of argument, and allegations of scripture, and modesty of deportment, and meekness and charity to the persons of men, they converted misbelievers, stopped the mouths of adversaries, asserted truth and discountenanced error; and those other stratagems and arts of support and maintenance to doctrines were the issues of heretical brains. The old catholics had nothing to secure themselves but the ἓν μέγα of truth and plain dealing.

Fidem minutis dissecant ambagibus,
Ut quisque lingua est nequior.
Solvunt ligantque quæstionum vincula
Per syllogismos plectiles.
Væ captiosis sycophantarum strophis,
Væ versipelli astutiæ.
Nodos tenaces recta rumpit regula,
Infesta discertantibus[t]:
Idcirco mundi stulta delegit Deus,
Ut concidant sophistica[u].

[s] [cap. ii. tom. iv. p. 211.]
[t] [al. 'dissertantibus.']
[u] [Prudent. præfat. in apotheos. lin. 21.]

And to my understanding it is a plain art and design of the devil, to make us so in love with our own opinions as to call them faith and religion, that we may be proud in our understanding: and besides that by our zeal in our opinions we grow cool in our piety and practical duties; he also by this earnest contention does directly destroy good life, by engagement of zealots to do any thing rather than be overcome and lose their beloved propositions. But I would fain know, why is not any vicious habit as bad or worse than a false opinion? why are we so zealous against those we call heretics, and yet great friends[x] with drunkards, fornicators, and swearers, and intemperate and idle persons! Is it because we are commanded by the apostle to 'reject a heretic after two admonitions[y],' and 'not to bid such a one God-speed[z] ?' It is a good reason why we should be zealous against such persons, provided we mistake them not. For those of whom these apostles speak, are such as deny Christ to be come in the flesh, such as deny an article of creed; and in such odious things it is not safe nor charitable to extend the *gravamen* and punishment beyond the instances the apostles make, or their exact parallels. But then also it would be remembered that the apostles speak as fiercely against communion with fornicators, and all disorders practical, as against communion with heretics[a]: "If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat." I am certain that a drunkard is as contrary to God, and lives as contrary to the laws of christianity, as a heretic; and I am also sure that I know what drunkenness is: but I am not sure that such an opinion is heresy; neither would other men be so sure as they think for if they did consider it aright, and observe the infinite deceptions, and causes of deceptions, in wise men, and in most things, and in all doubtful questions, and that they did not mistake confidence for certainty.

But indeed I could not but smile at those jolly friars[b]; two Franciscans offered themselves to the fire to prove Savonarola to be a heretic; but a certain Jacobine offered himself to the fire to prove that Savonarola had true revelations, and was no heretic: in the meantime Savonarola preached, but made no such confident offer, nor durst he venture at that new kind of fire-ordeal. And put case all four had passed through the fire and died in the flames, what would that have proved? Had he been a heretic or no heretic the more or the less for the confidence of these zealous idiots? If we mark it, a great many arguments whereon many sects rely are no better probation than this comes to: confidence is the first, and the second, and the third part, of a very great many of their propositions.

[x] [See Serm. xvi. on 'House of Feasting,' last two pages, vol. iv. p. 205, and note s.]

[y] [Tit. iii. 10.]

[z] [2 John 10.]

[a] [1 Cor. v. 11.]

[b] Commin. l. viii. c. 19. [lat. interpr. Barth. 8vo. Francof. 1629, p. 612. cap. 26. gall. tom. i. p. 595. 4to. Lond. et Paris. 1746.]

But now if men would a little turn the tables, and be as zealous for a good life and all the strictest precepts of christianity (which is a religion the most holy, the most reasonable, and the most consummate that ever was taught to man), as they are for such propositions in which neither the life nor the ornament of christianity is concerned, we should find that as a consequent of this piety men would be as careful as they could to find out all truths, and the sense of all revelations, which may concern their duty; and where men were miserable and could not, yet others that lived good lives too would also be so charitable as not to add affliction to this misery: and both of them are parts of good life. To be compassionate, and to help to bear one another's burdens, not to destroy the weak but to entertain him meekly, that's a precept of charity; and to endeavour to find out the whole will of God, that also is a part of the obedience, the choice and the excellency of faith: and he lives not a good life that does not do both these.

But men think they have more reason to be zealous against heresy than against a vice in manners, because heresy is infectious and dangerous, and the principle of much evil. Indeed if by a heresy we mean that which is against an article of creed, and breaks part of the covenant made between God and man by the mediation of Jesus Christ, I grant it to be a very grievous crime, a calling God's veracity into question, and a destruction also of good life; because upon the articles of creed obedience is built, and it lives or dies as the effect does by its proper cause, for faith is the moral cause of obedience. But then heresy that is such as this is also a vice, and the person criminal, and so the sin is to be esteemed in its degrees of malignity; and let men be as zealous against it as they can, and employ the whole arsenal of the spiritual armour against it: such as this is worse than adultery or murder inasmuch as the soul is more noble than the body, and a false doctrine is of greater dissemination and extent than a single act of violence or impurity. Adultery or murder is a duel, but heresy truly and indeed such is an unlawful war, it slays thousands. The loosing of faith is like digging down a foundation; all the superstructures of hope, and patience, and charity, fall with it. And besides this, heresy of all crimes is the most inexcusable, and of least temptation: for true faith is most commonly kept with the least trouble of any grace in the world; and heresy of itself hath not only no pleasure in it, but is a very punishment; because faith, as it opposes heretical or false opinions, and distinguishes from charity, consists in mere acts of believing; which because they are of true propositions, are natural and proportionable to the understanding, and more honourable than false. But then concerning those things which men now-a-days call heresy, they cannot be so formidable as they are represented; and if we consider that drunkenness is certainly a damnable sin, and that there are more drunkards than heretics, and that drunkenness is parent of a thou-

sand vices, it may better be said of this vice than of most of those opinions which we call heresies, 'it is infectious and dangerous, and the principle of much evil,' and therefore as fit an object for a pious zeal to contest against as is any of those opinions which trouble men's ease or reputation, for that is the greatest of their malignity.

But if we consider that sects are made and opinions are called heresies, upon interest and the grounds of emolument, we shall see that a good life would cure much of this mischief. For first, the church of Rome, which is the great dictatrix of dogmatical resolutions and the declarer of heresy, and calls heretic more than all the world besides, hath made that the rule of heresy which is the conservatory of interest and the ends of men. For to recede from the doctrine of the church with them makes heresy; that is, to disrepute their authority and not to obey them, not to be their subjects, not to give them the empire of our conscience, is the great κριτήριον of heresy.

So that with them heresy is to be esteemed clearly by human ends, not by divine rules; that is formal heresy, which does materially disserve them. And it would make a suspicious man a little inquisitive into their particular doctrines: and when he finds that indulgencies, and jubilees, and purgatories, and masses, and offices for the dead, are very profitable; that the doctrine of primacy, of infallibility, of superiority over councils, of indirect power in temporals, are great instruments of secular honour; he[c] would be apt enough to think that if the church of Rome would learn to lay her honour at the feet of the crucifix and despise the world, and prefer Jerusalem before Rome and heaven above the Lateran, that these opinions would not have in them any native strength to support them against the perpetual assaults of their adversaries, that speak so much reason and scripture against them. I have instanced in the Roman religion, but I wish it may be considered also how far men's doctrines in other sects serve men's temporal ends; so far that it would not be unreasonable or unnecessary to attempt to cure some of their distemperatures or mispersuasions by the salutary precepts of sanctity and holy life. Sure enough, if it did not more concern their reputation and their lasting interest to be counted true believers rather than good livers, they would rather endeavour to live well than to be accounted of a right opinion in things beside the creed.

For my own particular, I cannot but expect that God in His justice should enlarge the bounds of the Turkish empire, or some other way punish Christians, by reason of their pertinacious disputing about things unnecessary, undeterminable, and unprofitable, and for their hating and persecuting their brethren, which should be as dear to them as their own lives, for not consenting to one another's follies and senseless vanities. How many volumes have been writ about angels, about immaculate conception, about original sin, when that all

[c] ['he' om. A, B.]

that is solid reason or clear revelation in all these three articles may be reasonably enough comprised in forty lines? And in these trifles and impertinencies men are curiously busy, while they neglect those glorious precepts of christianity and holy life which are the glories of our religion, and would enable us to a happy eternity.

My lord, thus far my thoughts have carried me, and then I thought I had reason to go further, and to examine the proper grounds upon which these persuasions might rely and stand firm in case any body should contest against them. For possibly men may be angry at me and my design: for I do all them great displeasure who think no end is then well served when their interest is disserved; and but that I have writ so untowardly and heavily that I am not worth a confutation, possibly some or other might be writing against me. But then I must tell them I am prepared of an answer beforehand; for I think I have spoken reason in my book, and examined it with all the severity I have; and if after all this I be deceived, this confirms me in my first opinion, and becomes a new argument to me that I have spoken reason; for it furnishes me with a new instance that it is necessary there should be a mutual compliance and toleration, because even then when a man thinks he hath most reason to be confident he may easily be deceived.

For I am sure I have no other design but the prosecution and advantage of truth, and I may truly use the words of Gregory Nazianzen[d], *Non studemus paci in detrimentum veræ doctrinæ, ut facilitatis et mansuetudinis famam colligamus:* but I have writ this, because I thought it was necessary, and seasonable, and charitable, and agreeable to the great precepts and design of christianity, consonant to the practice of the apostles and of the best ages of the church, most agreeable to scripture and reason, to revelation and the nature of the thing; and it is such a doctrine that if there be variety in human affairs, if the event of things be not settled in a durable consistence but is changeable, every one of us all may have need of it. I shall only therefore desire that they who will read it may come to the reading it with as much simplicity of purposes and unmixed desires of truth as I did to the writing it, and that no man trouble himself with me or my discourse that thinks beforehand that his opinion cannot be reasonably altered. If he thinks me to be mistaken before he tries, let him also think that he may be mistaken too, and that he who judges before he hears is mistaken though he gives a right sentence.

Οὐ δεῖ σχετλιάζειν καὶ βοᾷν, πρὶν ἂν μάθῃς[e],

was good counsel. But at a venture, I shall leave this sentence of Solomon[f] to his consideration, "A wise man feareth, and departeth from evil; but a fool rageth, and is confident."—Πάντα εἰδέναι οἴεσθαι, καὶ διϊσχυρίζεσθαι, is a trick of boys, and bold young fellows,

[d] [vid. orat. vi. passim.] [e] Aristoph. in Pluto. [477.] [f] [Prov. xiv. 16.]

says Aristotle[g]; but they who either know themselves, or things, or persons, προστιθέασιν ἀεὶ τὸ ἴσως, καὶ τὸ τάχα. Peradventure yea, peradventure no, is very often the wisest determination of a question. For there are μωραὶ καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι ζητήσεις, as the apostle notes[h], 'foolish and unlearned questions:' and it were better to stop the current of such fopperies by silence, than by disputing them convey them to posterity. And many things there are of more profit, which yet are of no more certainty; and therefore boldness of assertion, except it be in matters of faith and clearest revelation, is an argument of the vanity of the man, never of the truth of the proposition: for to such matters the saying of Xenophanes in Varro[i] is pertinent and applicable, *Hominis est hæc opinari, Dei scire,* 'God only knows them, and we conjecture.'

Μάντις ἄριστος ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς[k].

And although I be as desirous to know what I should and what I should not, as any of my brethren the sons of Adam; yet I find that the more I search, the further I am from being satisfied, and make but few discoveries save of my own ignorance; and therefore I am desirous to follow the example of a very wise personage, Julius Agricola, of whom Tacitus[l] gave this testimony, *Retinuitque* (*quod est difficillimum*) *ex scientia modum:* or, that I may take my precedent from within the pale of the church, it was the saying of S. Austin[m], *Mallem quidem eorum quæ a me quæsivisti habere scientiam quam ignorantiam, sed quia id nondum potui, magis eligo cautam ignorantiam confiteri quam falsam scientiam profiteri;* and these words do very much express my sense. But if there be any man so confident as Luther sometime was, who said that he could expound all scripture; or so vain as Eckius[n], who in his *Chrysopassus* ventured upon the highest and most mysterious question of predestination, *ut in ea juveniles possit calores exercere;* such persons as these, or any that is furious in his opinion, will scorn me and my discourse; but I shall not be much moved at it, only I shall wish that I had as much knowledge as they think me to want, and they as much as they believe themselves to have. In the meantime modesty were better for us both, and indeed for all men. For when men indeed are knowing, amongst other things they are able to separate certainties from uncertainties: if they be not knowing, it is pity that their ignorance should be triumphant, or discompose the public peace or private confidence.

And now my lord, that I have inscribed this book to your lordship, although it be a design of doing honour to myself that I have marked

[g] [Rhet. ii. 12, 13.]
[h] [2 Tim. ii. 23.]
[i] [Apud Aug. de civ. Dei, vii. 17.]
[k] [Eurip. apud Plut. De orac. def., tom. vii. p. 701.]
[l] [In vit. Agric., cap. iv. tom. iv. p. 217.]
[m] [Ep. cxcvii. fin. tom. ii. p. 739 A.]
[n] [Præfat. in Chrysopassum Prædestinationis, fol. August. Vindel. 1512.]

it with so honoured and beloved a name, might possibly need as much excuse as it does pardon, but that your lordship knows your own; for out of your mines I have digged the mineral, only I have stamped it with my own image, as you may perceive by the deformities which are in it. But your great name in letters will add so much value to it, as to make it obtain its pardon amongst all them that know how to value you, and all your relatives and dependents by the proportion of relation. For others I shall be incurious, because the number of them that honour you is the same with them that honour learning and piety, and they are the best theatre, and the best judges; amongst which the world must needs take notice of my ambition*, to be ascribed by my public pretence to be what I am in all heartiness of devotion, and for all the reason of the world,

My honoured lord,

your lordship's most faithful,

and most affectionate servant,

JER. TAYLOR.

* [So punctuated in all the editions.]

ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ 'ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΗ,

OR,

A DISCOURSE

OF

THE LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING,

WITH

ITS JUST LIMITS AND TEMPER.

THE infinite variety of opinions in matters of religion, as they have troubled christendom with interests, factions, and partialities, so have they caused great divisions of the heart and variety of thoughts and designs amongst pious and prudent men. For they all, seeing the inconveniences which the disunion of persuasions and opinions have produced directly or accidentally, have thought themselves obliged to stop this inundation of mischiefs, and have made attempts accordingly. But it hath happened to most of them as to a mistaken physician, who gives excellent physic, but misapplies it, and so misses of his cure: so have these men; their attempts have therefore been ineffectual: for they put their help to a wrong part, or they have endeavoured to cure the symptoms, and have let the disease alone till it seemed incurable. Some have endeavoured to reunite these fractions by propounding such a guide which they were all bound to follow, hoping that the unity of a guide would have persuaded unity of minds; but who this guide should be at last became such a question, that it was made part of the fire that was to be quenched, so far was it from extinguishing any part of the flame. Others thought of a rule, and this must be the means of union, or nothing could do it. But supposing all the world had been agreed of this rule, yet the interpretation of it was so full of variety, that this also became part of the disease for which the cure was pretended. All men resolved upon this, that though they yet had not hit upon the right, yet some way must be thought upon to reconcile differences in opinion, thinking so long as this variety should last, Christ's kingdom was not advanced, and the work of the gospel went on but slowly. Few men in the

mean time considered that so long as men had such variety of principles, such several constitutions, educations, tempers and distempers, hopes, interests, and weaknesses, degrees of light and degrees of understanding, it was impossible all should be of one mind; and what is impossible to be done, is not necessary it should be done. And therefore although variety of opinions was impossible to be cured, and they who attempted it did like him who claps his shoulder to the ground to stop an earthquake; yet the inconveniences arising from it might possibly be cured, not by uniting their beliefs, that was to be despaired of, but by curing that which caused these mischiefs and accidental inconveniences of their disagreeings. For although these inconveniences which every man sees and feels were consequent to this diversity of persuasions, yet it was but accidentally and by chance; inasmuch as we see that in many things, and they of great concernment, men allow to themselves and to each other a liberty of disagreeing, and no hurt neither. And certainly if diversity of opinions were of itself the cause of mischiefs, it would be so ever, that is, regularly and universally: but that we see it is not. For there are disputes in christendom concerning matters of greater concernment than most of those opinions that distinguish sects and make factions; and yet because men are permitted to differ in those great matters, such evils are not consequent to such differences, as are to the uncharitable managing of smaller and more inconsiderable questions. It is of greater consequence to believe right in the question of the validity or invalidity of a death-bed repentance, than to believe aright in the question of purgatory; and the consequences of the doctrine of predetermination are of deeper and more material consideration than the products of the belief of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of private masses: and yet these great concernments, where a liberty of prophesying in these questions hath been permitted, have made no distinct communion, no sects of Christians, and the others have; and so have these too in those places where they have peremptorily been determined on either side. Since then if men are quiet and charitable in some disagreeings, that then and there the inconvenience ceases; if they were so in all others where lawfully they might (and they may in most) christendom should be no longer rent in pieces, but would be redintegrated in a new Pentecost. And although the Spirit of God did rest upon us in divided tongues, yet so long as those tongues were of fire, not to kindle strife but to warm our affections and inflame our charities, we should find that this variety of opinions in several persons would be looked upon as an argument only of diversity of operations, while the Spirit is the same: and that another man believes not so well as I, is only an argument that I have a better and a clearer illumination than he, that I have a better gift than he, received a special grace and favour, and excel him in this, and am perhaps excelled by him in many more. And if we all impartially endeavour to find a truth, since this endeavour and

search only is in our power, that we shall find it being *ab extra*, a gift and an assistance extrinsical, I can see no reason why this pious endeavour to find out truth shall not be of more force to unite us in the bonds of charity, than his[a] misery in missing it shall be to disunite us. So that since an union of persuasion is impossible to be attained, if we would attempt the cure by such remedies as are apt to enkindle and increase charity, I am confident we might see a blessed peace would be the reward and crown of such endeavours.

But men are now-a-days, and indeed always have been since the expiration of the first blessed ages of christianity, so in love with their own fancies and opinions as to think faith and all christendom is concerned in their support and maintenance; and whoever is not so fond and does not dandle them like themselves, it grows up to a quarrel which, because it is *in materia theologiæ*, is made a quarrel in religion, and God is entitled to it; and then if you are once thought an enemy to God, it is our duty to persecute you even to death, we do God good service in it: when if we should examine the matter rightly, the question is either *in materia non revelata*, or *minus evidenti*, or *non necessaria*, either it is not revealed, or not so clearly but that wise and honest men may be of different minds; or else it is not of the foundation of faith, but a remote superstructure; or else of mere speculation; or perhaps when all comes to all, it is a false opinion, or a matter of human interest, that we have so zealously contended for; for to one of these heads most of the disputes of christendom may be reduced; so that I believe the present fractions, or the most, are from the same cause which St. Paul[b] observed in the Corinthian schism, 'When there are divisions among you, are ye not carnal?' It is not the differing opinions that is the cause of the present ruptures, but want of charity; it is not the variety of understandings, but the disunion of wills and affections; it is not the several principles, but the several ends, that cause our miseries; our opinions commence and are upheld according as our turns are served and our interests are preserved, and there is no cure for us but piety and charity. A holy life will make our belief holy, if we consult not humanity and its imperfections in the choice of our religion, but search for truth without designs save only of acquiring heaven, and then be as careful to preserve charity as we were to get a point of faith; I am much persuaded we shall find out more truths by this means; or however, which is the main of all, we shall be secured though we miss them; and then we are well enough.

For if it be evinced that one heaven shall hold men of several opinions, if the unity of faith be not destroyed by that which men call differing religions, and if an unity of charity be the duty of us all, even towards persons that are not persuaded of every proposition we believe, then I would fain know to what purpose are all those stirs and great noises in christendom; those names of faction, the

[a] ['the,' C.] [b] [1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.]

several names of churches not distinguished by the division of kingdoms, *ut ecclesia sequatur imperium*, which was the primitive rule and canon[c], but distinguished by names of sects and men; these are all become instruments of hatred; thence come schisms and parting of communions, and then persecutions, and then wars and rebellion, and then the dissolutions of all friendships and societies. All these mischiefs proceed not from this, that all men are not of one mind, for that is neither necessary nor possible, but that every opinion is made an article of faith, every article is a ground of a quarrel, every quarrel makes a faction, every faction is zealous, and all zeal pretends for God, and whatsoever is for God cannot be too much: we by this time are come to that pass, we think we love not God except we hate our brother, and we have not the virtue of religion unless we persecute all religions but our own; for lukewarmness is so odious to God and man, that we proceeding furiously upon these mistakes, by supposing we preserve the body we destroy the soul of religion, or by being zealous for faith, or which is all one, for that which we mistake for faith, we are cold in charity, and so lose the reward of both.

All these errors and mischiefs must be discovered and cured, and that's the purpose of this discourse.

§ 1. Of the nature of faith, and that its duty is completed in believing the articles of the apostles' creed.

1. FIRST then it is of great concernment to know the nature and integrity of faith, for there begins our first and great mistake; for faith although it be of great excellency, yet when it is taken for a habit intellectual, it hath so little room and so narrow a capacity, that it cannot lodge thousands of those opinions which pretend to be of her family.

2. For although it be necessary for us to believe whatsoever we know to be revealed of God, and so every man does that believes there is a God; yet it is not necessary concerning many things to know that God hath revealed them; that is, we may be ignorant of or doubt concerning the propositions, and indifferently maintain either part, when the question is not concerning God's veracity but whether God hath said so or no: that which is of the foundation of faith, that only is necessary; and the knowing or not knowing of that, the believing or disbelieving it, is that only which *in genere credendorum* is in immediate and necessary order to salvation or damnation.

3. Now all the reason and demonstration of the world convinces us that this foundation of faith, or the great adequate object of the faith that saves us, is that great mysteriousness of christianity which Christ taught with so much diligence, for the credibility of which He wrought so many miracles, for the testimony of which the apostles endured persecutions, that which was a folly to the gentiles and a

[c] Optat., lib. iii. [vid. cap. 3. p. 56.]

scandal to the Jews; this is that which is the object of a Christian's faith: all other things are implicitly in the belief of the articles of God's veracity, and are not necessary in respect of the constitution of faith to be drawn out, but may there lie in the bowels of the great articles, without danger to any thing or any person, unless some other accident or circumstance makes them necessary. Now the great object which I speak of, is JESUS CHRIST CRUCIFIED; *Constitui enim apud vos nihil scire præter Jesum Christum et hunc crucifixum*, so saith S. Paul[d] to the church of Corinth. This is the article upon the confession of which Christ built His church, viz., only upon S. Peter's creed, which was no more but this simple enunciation, "We believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God[e]:" and to this salvation particularly is promised, as in the case of Martha's creed, John xi. 27. To this the scripture gives the greatest testimony, and to all them that confess it; "for every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God;" and "whoever confesseth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God[f]." The believing this article is the end of writing the four gospels; "for all these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;" and then that this is sufficient follows, "and that believing," viz., this article, for this was only instanced in, "ye might have life through His name[g]." This is that great article which *in genere credendorum* is sufficient disposition to prepare a catechumen to baptism, as appears in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch[h], whose creed was only this, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" and upon this confession, saith the story, they both went into the water, and the Ethiop was washed and became as white as snow.

4. In these particular instances there is no variety of articles, save only that in the annexes of the several expressions such things are expressed, as besides that Christ is come, they tell from whence, and to what purpose; and whatsoever is expressed or is to these purposes implied, is made articulate and explicate in the short and admirable mysterious creed of S. Paul, Rom. x. 9. "This is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." This is the great and entire complexion of a Christian's faith, and since salvation is promised to the belief of this creed, either a snare is laid for us with a purpose to deceive us, or else nothing is of prime and original necessity to be believed but this, JESUS CHRIST OUR REDEEMER; and all that which is the necessary parts, means, or main actions, of working this redemption for us and the honour for Him, is in the bowels and fold of the great article, and claims an explicit belief by the same reason that binds us to the

[d] [1 Cor. ii. 2.]
[e] [Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 69.]
[f] [1 John iv. 2, 15.]
[g] [John xx. 31.]
[h] [Acts viii. 37.]

belief of its first complexion, without which neither the thing could be acted nor the proposition understood.

5. For the act of believing propositions is not for itself, but in order to certain ends, as sermons are to good life and obedience; for (excepting that it acknowledges God's veracity and so is a direct act of religion) believing a revealed proposition hath no excellency in itself, but in order to that end for which we are instructed in such revelations. Now God's great purpose being to bring us to Him by Jesus Christ, Christ is our medium to God, obedience is the medium to Christ, and faith the medium to obedience, and therefore is to have its estimate in proportion to its proper end; and those things are necessary which necessarily promote the end, without which obedience cannot be encouraged or prudently enjoined: so that those articles are necessary, that is, those are fundamental points, upon which we build our obedience; and as the influence of the article is to the persuasion or engagement of obedience, so they have their degrees of necessity. Now all that Christ when He preached taught us to believe, and all that the apostles in their sermons propound, all aim at this, that we should acknowledge Christ for our Lawgiver and our Saviour; so that nothing can be necessary by a prime necessity to be believed explicitly, but such things which are therefore parts of the great article, because they either encourage our services, or oblige them, such as declare Christ's greatness in Himself or His goodness to us: so that although we must neither deny nor doubt of any thing which we know our great Master hath taught us, yet salvation is in special and by name annexed to the belief of those articles only which have in them the endearments of our services, or the support of our confidence, or the satisfaction of our hopes; such as are, Jesus Christ the Son of the living God, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, forgiveness of sins by His blood, resurrection of the dead, and life eternal; because these propositions qualify Christ for our Saviour and our Lawgiver, the one to engage our services, the other to endear them; for so much is necessary as will make us to be His servants and His disciples, and what can be required more? This only. Salvation is promised to the explicit belief of those articles, and therefore those only are necessary, and those are sufficient: but thus, to us in the formality of Christians, which is a formality superadded to a former capacity, we before we are Christians are reasonable creatures, and capable of a blessed eternity; and there is a creed which is the gentiles' creed, which is so supposed in the Christian's creed as it is supposed in a Christian to be a man, and that is, *Oportet accedentem ad Deum credere Deum esse, et esse remuneratorem quærentium eum*[k].

6. If any man will urge further that whatsoever is deducible from these articles by necessary consequence is necessary to be believed explicitly: I answer, it is true, if he sees the deduction and cohe-

[k] [Heb. xi. 6.]

rence of the parts; but it is not certain that every man shall be able to deduce whatsoever is either immediately or certainly deducible from these premises; and then since salvation is promised to the explicit belief of these, I see not how any man can justify the making the way to heaven narrower than Jesus Christ hath made it, it being already so narrow that there are few that find it.

7. In the pursuance of this great truth, the apostles, or the holy men their contemporaries and disciples, composed a creed[m], to be a rule of faith to all Christians, as appears in Irenæus[n], Tertullian[o], S. Cyprian[p], S. Austin[q], Ruffinus[r], and divers others[s]; which creed unless it had contained all the entire object of faith and the foundation of religion, it cannot be imagined to what purpose it should serve; and that it was so esteemed by the whole church of God in all ages, appears in this, that since faith is a necessary predisposition to baptism in all persons capable of the use of reason, all catechumens in the Latin church coming to baptism were interrogated concerning their faith, and gave satisfaction in the recitation of this creed. And in the east they professed exactly the same faith, something differing in words, but of the same matter, reason, design, and consequence; and so they did at Jerusalem, so at Aquileia. This was that ὀρθὴ καὶ ἀμώμητος πίστις, ἥνπερ κηρύττει ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον καινισμὸν δεξαμένη. These articles were τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν μετ' ἐκείνων διατρυψάντων ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις διδάγματα. *L.* 5. *Cod. de S. Trinit. et fid. cath.* '*Cum. recta*[t].' Now since the apostles and apostolical men and churches in these their symbols did recite particular articles to a considerable number, and were so minute in their recitation as to descend to circumstances, it is more than probable that they omitted nothing of necessity; and that these articles are not general principles, in the bosom of which many more articles equally necessary to be believed explicitly, and more particular, are enfolded; but that it is as minute an explication of those *prima credibilia* I before reckoned as is necessary to salvation.

8. And therefore Tertullian[u] calls the creed *Regulam fidei, qua salva et forma ejus manente in suo ordine, possit in scriptura tractari et inquiri si quid videtur vel ambiguitate pendere vel obscuritate*

[m] [See this point argued also by Comber, 'Companion to the Temple.']

[n] [vid. lib. i. cap. 10. p. 48.]

[o] Apol. contr. gent. c. 47. [p. 37 B.] De veland. virg. c. 1. [p. 173 A.]

[p] [Sive Ruffinus.] In exposit. Symbol. [ad calc. opp. S. Cypriani, p. 17.]

[q] Serm. v. de Tempore, c. 2. [i. e. Serm. v. de Symbolo, qui est Serm. cxv. de Tempore.—Ben. Serm. ccxli. tom. v. append. col. 395 F.]

[r] In Symbol. apud Cyprian. [vid. not. p, supra.]

[s] Omnes orthodoxi patres affirmant symbolum ab ipsis apostolis conditum. Sixt. Senensis, lib. ii. Bibl. S. [ad voc. 'Apostolorum Symbolum,' tom. i. p. 65.] vide Genebr., lib. iii. de Trin. [scil. in expos. Symbol. S. Athan. ad calc. Genebrardi in psalmos commentarii, 8vo. Lugd. 1607.]

[t] [Cod. Justinian., lib. i. tit. 1. cap. 5. col. 4. ed. Gothofred. 4to. Francof. 1688.]

[u] [vid. De præscript. adv. hærett. cap. xiii. sq. p. 206 sq.]

obumbrari. Cordis signaculum et nostræ militiæ sacramentum, S. Ambrose calls it, lib. iii. *De velandis virgin.*[x] *Comprehensio fidei nostræ atque perfectio,* by S. Austin, Serm. cxv.[y] *Confessio, expositio, regula fidei,* generally by the ancients. The profession of this creed was the exposition of that saying of S. Peter[z], Συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν, 'the answer of a good conscience towards God.' For of the recitation and profession of this creed in baptism it is that Tertullian, *De resur. carnis*[a], says, *Anima non lotione sed responsione sancitur.*—And of this was the prayer of Hilary, lib. xii. *de Trinit.*[b] *Conserva . . hanc conscientiæ meæ vocem, ut quod in regenerationis meæ symbolo baptizatus in Patre et Filio et Spir. S. professus sum, semper obtineam.* And according to the rule and reason of this discourse (that it may appear that the creed hath in it all articles *primo et per se,* 'primely and universally' necessary) the creed is just such an explication of that faith which the apostles preached, viz., the creed which S. Paul recites, as contains in it all those things which entitle Christ to us in the capacities of our Lawgiver and our Saviour, such as enable Him to the great work of redemption, according to the predictions concerning Him, and such as engage and encourage our services. For taking out the article of Christ's descent into hell (which was not in the old creed, as appears in some of the copies I before referred to, in Tertullian, Ruffinus, and Irenæus; and indeed was omitted in all the confessions of the eastern churches, in the church of Rome, and in the Nicene creed, which by adoption came to be the creed of the Catholic church) all other articles are such as directly constitute the parts and work of our redemption, such as clearly derive the honour to Christ, and enable Him with the capacities of our Saviour and Lord. The rest engage our services by proposition of such articles which are rather promises than propositions; and the whole creed, take it in any of the old forms, is but an analysis of that which S. Paul calls 'the word of salvation whereby we shall be saved,' viz. that 'we confess Jesus to be Lord, and that God raised Him from the dead;' by the first whereof He became our Lawgiver and our Guardian; by the second He was our Saviour: the other things are but parts and main actions of those two. Now what reason there is in the world that can inwrap any thing else within the foundation, that is, in the whole body of articles, simply and inseparably necessary, or in the prime original necessity of faith, I cannot possibly imagine. These do the work; and therefore nothing can upon the true grounds of reason enlarge the necessity to the enclosure of other articles.

9. Now if more were necessary than the articles of the creed, I

[x] [cap. 4. § 20. tom. ii. col. 179.]
[y] [vid. not. q, supra.]
[z] [1 Pet. iii. 21.]
[a] [cap. xlviii. p. 355 B.]
[b] [§ 57. col. 1144.]

demand why was it made the characteristic[c] note of a Christian from a heretic, or a Jew, or an infidel? or to what purpose was it composed? or if this was intended as sufficient, did the apostles, or those churches which they founded, know any thing else to be necessary? If they did not, then either nothing more is necessary (I speak of matters of mere belief) or they did not know all the will of the Lord, and so were unfit dispensers of the mysteries of the kingdom; or if they did know more was necessary and yet would not insert it, they did an act of public notice, and consigned it to all ages of the church, to no purpose unless to beguile credulous people by making them believe their faith was sufficient, having tried it by that touchstone apostolical, when there was no such matter.

10. But if this was sufficient to bring men to heaven then, why not now? If the apostles admitted all to their communion that believed this creed, why shall we exclude any that preserve the same entire? why is not our faith of these articles of as much efficacy for bringing us to heaven as it was in the churches apostolical, who had guides more infallible that might without error have taught them superstructures enough if they had been necessary? And so they did; but that they did not insert them into the creed, when they might have done it with as much certainty as these articles, makes it clear to my understanding that other things were not necessary, but these were; that whatever profit and advantages might come from other articles, yet these were sufficient, and however certain persons might accidentally be obliged to believe much more, yet this was the one and only foundation of faith upon which all persons were to build their hopes of heaven; this was therefore necessary to be taught to all, because of necessity to be believed by all: so that although other persons might commit a delinquency *in genere morum* if they did not know or did not believe much more, because they were obliged to further disquisitions in order to other ends, yet none of these who held the creed entire could perish for want of necessary faith, though possibly he might for supine negligence or affected ignorance, or some other fault which had influence upon his opinions and his understanding, he having a new supervening obligation *ex accidente* to know and believe more.

11. Neither are we obliged to make these articles more particular and minute than the creed. For since the apostles and indeed our blessed Lord himself promised heaven to them who believed Him to be the Christ that was to come into the world, and that he who believes in Him should be partaker of the resurrection and life eternal, He will be as good as His word; yet because this article was very general, and a complexion rather than a single proposition, the

[c] Vid. Isidor. de eccl. offic. [lib. ii. cap. 23. tom. vi. p. 460.] Suid. [vid. in voc. σύμβολον.] Turneb., lib. ii. c. 30. advers. [col. 68. ed. fol. 1599.] Venant. Fortun. in exeg. Symb. [in Bibl. vett. patr. Galland., tom. xii. p. 317.] Fevardent. in Iren., lib. i. cap. 2. [p. 51. fol. Par. 1675.]

apostles and others our fathers in Christ did make it more explicit; and though they have said no more than what lay entire and ready formed in the bosom of the great article, yet they made their extracts to great purpose and absolute sufficiency, and therefore there needs no more deductions or remoter consequences from the first great article than the creed of the apostles. For although whatsoever is certainly deduced from any of these articles, made already so explicit, is as certainly true, and as much to be believed, as the article itself, because

Ex veris possunt nil nisi vera sequi,

yet because it is not certain that our deductions from them are certain, and what one calls evident is so obscure to another that he believes it false, it is the best and only safe course to rest in that explication the apostles have made; because if any of these apostolical deductions were not demonstrable evidently to follow from that great article to which salvation is promised, yet the authority of them who compiled the symbol, the plain description of the articles from the words of scriptures, the evidence of reason demonstrating these to be the whole foundation, are sufficient upon great grounds of reason to ascertain us: but if we go further, besides the easiness of being deceived, we relying upon our own discourses, which though they may be true and then bind us to follow them, but yet no more than when they only seem truest, yet they cannot make the thing certain to another, much less necessary in itself. And since God would not bind us upon pain of sin and punishment to make deductions ourselves, much less would He bind us to follow another man's logic as an article of our faith; I say much less another man's, for our own integrity (for we will certainly be true to ourselves and do our own business heartily) is as fit and proper to be employed as another man's ability: he cannot secure me that his ability is absolute and the greatest, but I can be more certain that my own purposes and fidelity to myself is such. And since it is necessary to rest somewhere lest we should run to an infinity, it is best to rest there where the apostles and the churches apostolical rested; when not only they who are able to judge, but others who are not, are equally ascertained of the certainty and of the sufficiency of that explication.

12. This I say, not that I believe it unlawful or unsafe for the church, or any of the *antistites religionis*, or any wise man, to extend his own creed to any thing may certainly follow from any one of the articles; but I say that no such deduction is fit to be pressed on others as an article of faith; and that every deduction which is so made, unless it be such a thing as is at first evident to all, is but sufficient to make a human faith; nor can it amount to a divine, much less can be obligatory to bind a person of a differing persuasion to subscribe under pain of losing his faith or being a heretic. For it is a demonstration that nothing can be necessary to be believed

under pain of damnation, but such propositions of which it is certain that God hath spoken and taught them to us, and of which it is certain that this is their sense and purpose; for if the sense be uncertain, we can no more be obliged to believe it in a certain sense, than we are to believe it at all if it were not certain that God delivered it. But if it be only certain that God spake it, and not certain to what sense, our faith of it is to be as indeterminate as its sense; and it can be no other in the nature of the thing, nor is it consonant to God's justice to believe of Him that He can or will require more. And this is of the nature of those propositions which Aristotle calls θέσεις, to which without any further probation all wise men will give assent at its first publication. And therefore deductions inevident, from the evident and plain letter of faith, are as great recessions from the obligation, as they are from the simplicity and certainty of the article. And this I also affirm, although the church of any one denomination, or represented in a council, shall make the deduction or declaration. For unless Christ had promised His spirit to protect every particular church from all errors less material, unless He had promised an absolute universal infallibility *etiam in minutioribus*, unless superstructures be of the same necessity with the foundation, and that God's spirit doth not only preserve His church in the being of a church, but in a certainty of not saying any thing that is less certain; and that whether they will or no too; we may be bound to peace and obedience, to silence and to charity, but have not a new article of faith made; and a new proposition, though consequent (as 'tis said) from an article of faith, becomes not therefore a part of the faith, nor of absolute necessity. *Quid unquam aliud ecclesia conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur*, said Vincentius Lirinensis[d]: whatsoever was of necessary belief before[e] is so still, and hath a new degree added by reason of a new light or a clear explication; but no propositions can be adopted into the foundation. The church hath power to intend our faith, but not to extend it; to make our belief more evident, but not more large and comprehensive. For Christ and His apostles concealed nothing that was necessary to the integrity of christian faith or salvation of our souls; Christ declared all the will of His Father, and the apostles were stewards and dispensers of the same mysteries, and were faithful in all the house, and therefore concealed nothing, but taught the whole doctrine of Christ; so they said themselves. And indeed if they did not teach all the doctrine of faith, an angel or a man might have taught us other things than what they taught without deserving an *anathema*, but not without deserving a blessing, for making up that faith entire which the apostles left imperfect. Now if they taught all the whole body of faith, either the church in the following ages lost part of the faith (and then where was their infallibility, and the effect of those glorious promises

[d] Contra Hæres., cap. 32. [al. 23. p. 112.] [e] ['before,' om. C.]

to which she pretends and hath certain title? for she may as well introduce a falsehood as lose a truth, it being as much promised to her that the Holy Ghost shall lead her into all truth as that she shall be preserved from all errors, as appears John xvi. 13,) or if she retained all the faith which Christ and His apostles consigned and taught, then no age can by declaring any point make that be an article of faith which was not so in all ages of christianity before such declaration. And indeed if the church[f] by declaring an article can make that to be necessary which before was not necessary, I do not see how it can stand with the charity of the church so to do, especially after so long experience she hath had that all men will not believe every such decision or explication; for by so doing she makes the narrow way to heaven narrower, and chalks out one path more to the devil than he had before, and yet the way was broad enough when it was at the narrowest. For before, differing persons might be saved in diversity of persuasions; and now after this declaration if they cannot, there is no other alteration made but that some shall be damned who before even in the same dispositions and belief should have been beatified persons. For therefore it is well for the fathers of the primitive church that their errors were not discovered; for if they had been contested (for that would have been called discovery enough,) *vel errores emendassent, vel ab ecclesia ejecti fuissent*[g]. But it is better as it was; they went to heaven by that good fortune, whereas otherwise they might have gone to the devil. And yet there were some errors, particularly that of S. Cyprian[h] that was discovered, and he went to heaven, 'tis thought: possibly they might so too for all this pretence. But suppose it true, yet whether that declaration of an article of which with safety we either might have doubted or been ignorant, does more good, than the damning of those many souls occasionally, but yet certainly and foreknowingly, does hurt, I leave it to all wise and good men to determine. And yet besides this it cannot enter into my thoughts that it can possibly consist with God's goodness to put it into the power of man so palpably and openly to alter the paths and inlets to heaven and to straiten His mercies, unless He had furnished these men with an infallible judgment, and an infallible prudence, and a never-failing charity, that they should never do it but with great necessity, and with great truth, and without ends and human designs; of which I think no arguments can make us certain. What the primitive church hath done in this case, I shall afterwards consider, and give an account of it; but for the present there is no insecurity in ending there where the apostles ended, in building where they built, in resting where they left us, unless the

[f] Vide Jacob. Almain. in iii. sent. d. 25. q. unic. dub. 3. [fol. lxxx.]—Patet ergo quod nulla veritas est catholica ex approbatione ecclesiæ vel papæ. Gabr. Biel. in iii. sent. dist. 25. q. unic. art. 3. dub. 3. ad finem. [p. 254.]

[g] Bellar. de Laicis, l. iii. c. 20. sect. 'Ad primam confirmationem.' [tom. ii. col. 681.]

[h] [Vid. ep. lxx. p. 189 sqq.]

same infallibility which they had had still continued, which I think I shall hereafter make evident it did not. And therefore those extensions of creed which were made in the first ages of the church, although for the matter they were most true, yet because it was not certain that they should be so and they might have been otherwise, therefore they could not be in the same order of faith nor in the same degrees of necessity to be believed with the articles apostolical; and therefore whether they did well or no in laying the same weight upon them, or whether they did lay the same weight or no, we will afterwards consider.

13. But to return. I consider that a foundation of faith cannot alter; unless a new building be to be made, the foundation is the same still; and this foundation is no other but that which Christ and His apostles laid, which doctrine is like Himself, yesterday and to-day, and the same for ever. So that the articles of necessary belief to all (which are the only foundation) they cannot be several in several ages and to several persons. Nay, the sentence and declaration of the church cannot lay this foundation, or make any thing of the foundation, because the church cannot lay her own foundation; we must suppose her to be a building, and that she relies upon the foundation, which is therefore supposed to be laid before because she is built upon it; or (to make it more explicate) because a cloud may arise from the allegory of building and foundation, it is plainly thus: the church being a company of men obliged to the duties of faith and obedience, the duty and obligation being of the faculties of will and understanding to adhere to such an object, must presuppose the object made ready for them; for as the object is before the act in order of nature, and therefore not to be produced or increased by the faculty, which is receptive, cannot be active upon its proper object; so the object of the church's faith is in order of nature before the church, or before the act and habit of faith, and therefore cannot be enlarged by the church, any more than the act of the visive faculty can add visibility to the object. So that if we have found out what foundation Christ and His apostles did lay, that is, what body and system of articles simply necessary they taught and required of us to believe, we need not, we cannot go any further for foundation, we cannot enlarge that system or collection. Now then, although all that they said is true, and nothing of it to be doubted or disbelieved, yet as all that they said is neither written nor delivered, because all was not necessary; so we know that of those things which are written some things are as far off from the foundation as those things which were omitted; and therefore although now accidentally they must be believed by all that know them, yet it is not necessary all should know them; and that all should know them in the same sense and interpretation, is neither probable nor obligatory; but therefore since these things are to be distinguished by some differences of necessary and not necessary, whether or no is not the declaration of Christ and

His apostles, affixing salvation to the belief of some great comprehensive articles, and the act of the apostles rendering them as explicit as they thought convenient, and consigning that creed, made so explicit, as a *tessera* of a Christian, as a comprehension of the articles of his belief, as a sufficient disposition and an express of the faith of a *catechumen* in order to baptism: whether or no, I say, all this be not sufficient probation that these only are of absolute necessity, that this is sufficient for mere belief in order to heaven, and that therefore whosoever believes these articles heartily and explicitly, Θεὸς μένει ἐν αὐτῷ, as S. John's[1] expression is, 'God dwelleth in him,' I leave it to be considered and judged of from the premises. Only this: if the old doctors had been made judges in these questions, they would have passed their affirmative; for to instance in one for all, of this it was said by Tertullian[k], *Regula quidem fidei una omnino est sola immobilis et irreformabilis, &c. Hac lege fidei manente, cætera jam disciplinæ et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis, operante scilicet et proficiente usque in finem gratia Dei;* 'this symbol is the one sufficient, immovable, unalterable, and unchangeable rule of faith, that admits no increment or decrement; but if the integrity and unity of this be preserved, in all other things men may take a liberty of enlarging their knowledges and prophesyings, according as they are assisted by the grace of God.'

§ 2. Of heresy, and the nature of it; and that it is to be accounted according to the strict capacity of christian faith, and not in opinions speculative, nor ever to pious persons.

1. And thus I have represented a short draught of the object of faith, and its foundation. The next consideration in order to our main design is to consider what was, and what ought to be, the judgment of the apostles concerning heresy: for although there are more kinds of vices than there are of virtues, yet the number of them is to be taken by accounting the transgressions of their virtues, and by the limits of faith; we may also reckon the analogy and proportions of heresy, that as we have seen who was called faithful by the apostolical men, we may also perceive who were listed by them in the catalogue of heretics, that we in our judgments may proceed accordingly.

2. And first the word heresy is used in scripture indifferently, in a good sense for a sect or division of opinion, and men following it, or sometimes in a bad sense, for a false opinion signally condemned; but these kind of people were then called Antichrists and false prophets more frequently than heretics, and then there were many of them in the world. But it is observable that no heresies are noted *signanter* in scripture, but such as are great errors practical *in materia pietatis*, such whose doctrines taught impiety, or such who denied the coming of Christ directly or by consequence, not remote or wiredrawn[l], but prime and immediate; and therefore in

[1] [1 John iv. 16.] [k] Lib. de veland. virg. [c. i. p. 173.] [l] ['withdrawn,' B, C.]

the Code *de S. Trinitate et fide catholica*[m], heresy is called ἀσεβὴς δόξα, καὶ ἀθέμιτος διδασκαλία, 'a wicked opinion and an ungodly doctrine.'

3. The first false doctrine we find condemned by the apostles was the opinion of Simon Magus, who thought the Holy Ghost was to be bought with money: he thought very dishonourably to the Blessed Spirit; but yet his followers are rather noted of a vice, neither resting in the understanding, nor derived from it, but wholly practical; 'tis simony, not heresy, though in Simon it was a false opinion proceeding from a low account of God, and promoted by his own ends of pride and covetousness. The great heresy that troubled them was the doctrine of the necessity of keeping the law of Moses, the necessity of circumcision; against which doctrine they were therefore zealous because it was a direct overthrow to the very end and excellency of Christ's coming. And this was an opinion most pertinaciously and obstinately maintained by the Jews, and had made a sect among the Galatians[n]; and this was indeed wholly in opinion; and against it the apostles opposed two articles of the creed, which served at several times according as the Jews changed their opinion, and left some degrees of their error, 'I believe in Jesus Christ,' and 'I believe the holy catholic church;' for they therefore pressed the necessity of Moses' law, because they were unwilling to forego the glorious appellative of being God's own peculiar people, and that 'salvation was of the Jews,' and that the rest of the world were capable of that grace no otherwise but by adoption into their religion and becoming proselytes: But this was so ill a doctrine, as that it overthrew the great benefits of Christ's coming; for "if they were circumcised, Christ profited them nothing:" meaning this, that Christ will not be a Saviour to them who do not acknowledge Him for their Lawgiver; and they neither confess Him their Lawgiver nor their Saviour, that look to be justified by the law of Moses and observation of legal rites: so that this doctrine was a direct enemy to the foundation, and therefore the apostles were so zealous against it. Now then that other opinion which the apostles met at Jerusalem to resolve was but a piece of that opinion; for the Jews and proselytes were drawn off from their lees and sediment by degrees, step by step. At first they would not endure any should be saved but themselves and their proselytes. Being wrought off from this height by miracles and preaching of the apostles, they admitted the gentiles to a possibility of salvation, but yet so as to hope for it by Moses' law. From which foolery when they were with much ado dissuaded, and told that salvation was by faith in Christ, not by works of the law, yet they resolved to plough with an ox and an ass still, and join Moses with Christ; not as shadow and substance, but in an equal confedera-

[m] ['Impiam .. opinionem, .. nefariam.. doctrinam.'—Cod. Justinian., lib. i. tit. 1. cap. 3. § 2.—vid. p. 371, not. t, supra.]

[n] [But concerning the real error of the Galatians, see Paley, Hor. Paul. cap. v. num. 10.]

tion, Christ should save the gentiles if He was helped by Moses, but alone christianity could not do it. Against this the apostles assembled at Jerusalem, and made a decision of the question, tying some of the gentiles (such only who were blended by the Jews *in communi patria*) to observation of such rites which the Jews had derived by tradition from Noah[o], intending by this to satisfy the Jews as far as might be with a reasonable compliance and condescension; the other gentiles who were unmixed in the meanwhile remaining free, as appears in the liberty S. Paul gave the church of Corinth of eating idol sacrifices (expressly against the decree at Jerusalem) so it were without scandal. And yet for all this care and curious discretion, a little of the leaven still remained: all this they thought did so concern the gentiles that it was totally impertinent to the Jews; still they had a distinction to satisfy the letter of the apostles' decree, and yet to persist in their old opinion; and this so continued that fifteen christian bishops in succession were circumcised, even until the destruction of Jerusalem under Adrian, as Eusebius[p] reports.

4. First, by the way let me observe that never any matter of question in the christian church was determined with greater solemnity or more full authority of the church than this question concerning circumcision: no less than the whole college of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, and that with a decree of the highest sanction, *Visum est Spiritui sancto et nobis.* Secondly, either the case of the Hebrews in particular was omitted, and no determination concerning them whether it were necessary or lawful for them to be circumcised, or else it was involved in the decree, and intended to oblige the Jews. If it was omitted, since the question was *de re necessaria* (for *dico vobis*, 'I Paul say unto you, if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing') it is very remarkable how the apostles, to gain the Jews and to comply with their violent prejudice in behalf of Moses' law, did for a time tolerate their dissent *etiam in re alioquin necessaria*, which I doubt not but was intended as a precedent for the church to imitate for ever after: but if it was not omitted, either all the multitude of the Jews (which S. James, then their bishop, expressed by πόσαι μυριάδες, 'thou seest how many myriads of Jews that believe, and yet are zealots for the law[q]:' and Eusebius[r], speaking of Justus, says he was one *ex infinita multitudine eorum qui ex circumcisione in Jesum credebant*) I say all these did perish, and their believing in Christ served them to no other ends but in the infinity of their torments to upbraid them with hypocrisy and heresy; or if they were saved, it is apparent how merciful God was and pitiful to human infirmities, that in a point of so great concernment did pity their weakness, and pardon their errors, and love their good mind; since their prejudice was little less than insuperable,

[o] [Cf. Duct. Dubit., bk. ii. chap. 2. rule 2.]

[p] Eccles. hist., lib. iv. c. 5. [p. 143.]

[q] Acts xxi. 20.

[r] Eccles. hist., lib. iii. c. 35. [p. 129.]

and had fair probabilities at least, it was such as might abuse a wise and good man, and so it did many, they did *bono animo errare*[s]. And if I mistake not, this consideration S. Paul[t] urged as a reason why God forgave him, who was a persecutor of the saints, because he did it "ignorantly in unbelief," that is, he was not convinced in his understanding of the truth of the way which he persecuted, he in the meanwhile remaining in that incredulity not out of malice or ill ends, but the mistakes of humanity and a pious zeal; therefore "God had mercy on him:" and so it was in this great question of circumcision; here only was the difference, the invincibility of S. Paul's error, and the honesty of his heart, caused God so to pardon him as to bring him to the knowledge of Christ, which God therefore did because it was necessary, *necessitate medii;* no salvation was consistent with the actual remanency of that error; but in the question of circumcision, although they by consequence did overthrow the end of Christ's coming, yet because it was such a consequence which they being hindered by a prejudice not impious did not perceive, God tolerated them in their error, till time, and a continual dropping of the lessons and dictates apostolical did wear it out, and then the doctrine put on its apparel, and became clothed with necessity; they in the mean time so kept to the foundation, that is, Jesus Christ crucified and risen again, that although this did make a violent concussion of it, yet they held fast with their heart what they ignorantly destroyed with their tongue (which Saul before his conversion did not) that God upon other titles than an actual dereliction of their error did bring them to salvation.

5. And in the descent of so many years I find not any one anathema past by the apostles or their successors upon any of the bishops of Jerusalem, or the believers of the circumcision, and yet it was a point as clearly determined, and of as great necessity, as any of those questions that at this day vex and crucify christendom.

6. Besides this question, and that of the resurrection, commenced in the church of Corinth, and promoted with some variety of sense by Hymenæus and Philetus in Asia, who said that the resurrection was past already, I do not remember any other heresy named in scripture but such as were errors of impiety, *seductiones in materia practica;* such as was particularly forbidding to marry, and the heresy of the Nicolaitans, a doctrine that taught[u] the necessity of lust and frequent fornication.

7. But in all the animadversions against errors made by the apostles in the New testament, no pious person was condemned, no man that did invincibly err, or *bona mente;* but something that was amiss *in genere morum* was that which the apostles did redargue. And it is very considerable that even they of the circumcision who in so great numbers did heartily believe in Christ, and yet most violently retain

[s] ['Errant, sed bono animo errant.'—Salvian. de gubern. Dei, lib. v. p. 87.]

[t] [1 Tim. i. 13.]

[u] [sed vid. p. 390 infra.]

circumcision, and without question went to heaven in great numbers; yet of the number of these very men, they came deeply under censure when to their error they added impiety: so long as it stood with charity and without human ends and secular interest, so long it was either innocent or connived at; but when they grew covetous, and for filthy lucre's sake taught the same doctrine which others did in the simplicity of their hearts, then they turned heretics, then they were termed seducers; and Titus[x] was commanded to look to them, and to silence them; "for there are many that are intractable and vain babblers, seducers of minds, especially they of the circumcision, who seduce whole houses, teaching things that they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." These indeed were not to be endured, but to be silenced by the conviction of sound doctrine, and to be rebuked sharply, and avoided.

8. For heresy is not an error of the understanding but an error of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in scripture, in the style whereof faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness and sanctity. So in S. Paul[y], "For," saith he, "the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned;" *a quibus quod aberrarunt quidam,* 'from which charity, and purity, and goodness, and sincerity, because some have wandered,' *deflexerunt ad vaniloquium.* And immediately after he reckons the oppositions to faith and sound doctrine; and instances only in vices that stain the lives of Christians, "the unjust, the unclean, the uncharitable, the liar, the perjured person," *et si quis alius qui sanæ doctrinæ adversatur;* these are the enemies of the true doctrine. And therefore S. Peter having given in charge to 'add to our virtue, patience, temperance, charity, and the like,' gives this for a reason, "for if these things be in you and abound, ye shall be fruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." So that knowledge and faith is *inter præcepta morum,* is part of a good life[z]. And S. Paul calls faith, or the form of sound words, κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίαν, 'the doctrine that is according to godliness,' 1 Tim. vi. 3[a]. And *veritati credere,* and *in injustitia sibi complacere,* are by the same apostle opposed, and intimate that piety and faith is all one thing; faith must be ὑγιὴς καὶ ἄμωμος, entire and holy too, or it is not right. It was the heresy of the Gnostics that it was no matter how men lived, so they did but believe aright; which wicked doctrine Tatianus[b] a learned Christian did so detest, that he fell into a quite contrary, *Non est curandum quod quisque credat; id tantum curandum est quod quisque*

[x] [Tit. i. 10 sq.]

[y] [1 Tim. i. 5 sqq.]

[z] Quid igitur credulitas vel fides? Opinor, fideliter hominem Christo credere, id est, fidelem Deo esse, hoc est, fideliter Dei mandata servare. So Salvian. [De gubern. Dei, lib. iii. p. 37 fin.]

[a] Εὐσεβὴς τῶν χριστιανῶν θρησκεία. That's our religion, or faith, the whole manner of serving God. C. de Summa Trinit. et fide cathol. [vid. p. 371, not. t, supra.]

[b] [Epiphan. hær. xlvi. vol. i. p. 390.]

faciat; and thence came the sect Encratites: both these heresies sprang from the too nice distinguishing the faith from the piety and good life of a Christian: they are both but one duty. However, they may be distinguished if we speak like philosophers, they cannot be distinguished when we speak like Christians. For to believe what God hath commanded is in order to a good life; and to live well is the product of that believing, and as proper emanation from it as from its proper principle, and as heat is from the fire. And therefore in scripture they are used promiscuously in sense and in expression, as not only being subjected in the same person, but also in the same faculty; faith is as truly seated in the will as in the understanding, and a good life as merely derives from the understanding as the will. Both of them are matters of choice and of election, neither of them an effect natural and invincible, or necessary antecedently; *necessaria ut fiant, non necessario facta.* And indeed if we remember that S. Paul reckons heresy amongst the works of the flesh, and ranks it with all manner of practical impieties, we shall easily perceive that if a man mingles not a vice with his opinion, if he be innocent in his life though deceived in his doctrine, his error is his misery, not his crime; it makes him an argument of weakness and an object of pity, but not a person sealed up to ruin and reprobation.

9. For as the nature of faith is, so is the nature of heresy, contraries having the same proportion and commensuration. Now faith, if it be taken for an act of the understanding merely, is so far from being that excellent grace that justifies us, that it is not good at all in any kind but *in genere naturæ,* and makes the understanding better in itself, or pleasing to God, just as strength doth the arm, or beauty the face, or health the body; these are natural perfections indeed, and so knowledge and a true belief is to the understanding. But this makes us not at all more acceptable to God; for then the unlearned were certainly in a damnable condition, and all good scholars should be saved; whereas I am afraid too much of the contrary is true. But unless faith be made moral by the mixtures of choice, and charity, it is nothing but a natural perfection, not a grace or a virtue; and this is demonstrably proved in this, that by the confession of all men of all interests and persuasions, in matters of mere belief invincible ignorance is our excuse if we be deceived; which could not be, but that neither to believe aright is commendable, nor to believe amiss is reprovable, but where both one and the other is voluntary and chosen antecedently or consequently, by prime election or *ex post facto,* and so comes to be considered in morality, and is part of a good life or a bad life respectively. Just so it is in heresy; if it be a design of ambition, and making of a sect (so Erasmus[c] expounds S. Paul, αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον, *sectarum*[d] *aucto-*

[c] [In Tit. iii. 10. tom. vi. col. 974.]

[d] Alieni sunt a veritate, qui se obarmant multitudine.—Chrys.

rem) if it be for filthy lucre's sake, as it was in some that were of the circumcision; if it be of pride and love of pre-eminence, as it was in Diotrephes, ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων; or out of peevishness and indocibleness of disposition, or of a contentious spirit, that is, that their feet are not shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; in all these cases the error is just so damnable as is its principle; but therefore damnable not of itself, but by reason of its adherency. And if any shall say any otherwise, it is to say that some men shall be damned when they cannot help it, perish without their own fault, and be miserable for ever, because of their unhappiness to be deceived through their own simplicity and natural or accidental, but inculpable infirmity.

10. For it cannot stand with the goodness of God, who does so know our infirmities that He pardons many things in which our wills indeed have the least share (but some they have) but are overborne with the violence of an impetuous temptation; I say it is inconsistent with His goodness to condemn those who err, where the error hath nothing of the will in it; who therefore cannot repent of their error, because they believe it true; who therefore cannot make compensation because they know not that they are tied to dereliction of it. And although all heretics are in this condition, that is, they believe their errors to be true; yet there is a vast difference between them who believe so out of simplicity, and them who are given over to believe a lie as a punishment, or an effect of some other wickedness or impiety. For all have a concomitant assent to the truth of what they believe, and no man can at the same time believe what he does not believe; but this assent of the understanding in heretics is caused not by force of argument, but the argument is made forcible by something that is amiss in his will; and although a heretic may peradventure have a stronger argument for his error than some true believer for his right persuasion, yet it is not considerable how strong his argument is (because in a weak understanding a small motive will produce a great persuasion, like gentle physic in a weak body) but that which here is considerable is, what it is that made his argument forcible: if his invincible and harmless prejudice, if his weakness, if his education, if his mistaking piety, if any thing that hath no venom nor a sting in it, there the heartiness of his persuasion is no sin, but his misery and his excuse: but if any thing that is evil *in genere morum* did incline his understanding; if his opinion did commence upon pride, or is nourished by covetousness, or continues through stupid carelessness, or increases by pertinacy, or is confirmed by obstinacy, then the innocency of the error is disbanded, his misery is changed into a crime, and begins its own punishment.—But by the way I must observe, that when I reckoned 'obstinacy' amongst those things which make a false opinion criminal, it is to be understood with some discretion and distinction. For there is an obstinacy of will, which is indeed highly guilty of misdemeanour; and when the

school makes pertinacy or obstinacy to be the formality of heresy, they say not true at all unless it be meant the obstinacy of the will and choice; and if they do, they speak imperfectly and inartificially, this being but one of the causes that makes error become heresy; the adequate and perfect formality of heresy is whatsoever makes the error voluntary and vicious, as is clear in scripture, reckoning covetousness, and pride, and lust, and whatsoever is vicious, to be its causes: and in habits or moral changes and productions, whatever alters the essence of a habit or gives it a new formality, is not to be reckoned the efficient, but the form. But there is also an obstinacy, you may call it, but indeed is nothing but a resolution and confirmation of understanding, which is not in a man's power honestly to alter, and it is not all the commands of humanity that can be argument sufficient to make a man leave believing that for which he thinks he hath reason, and for which he hath such arguments as heartily convince him. Now the persisting in an opinion finally, and against all the confidence and imperiousness of human commands, that makes not this criminal obstinacy, if the erring person have so much humility of will as to submit to whatever God says, and that no vice in his will hinders him from believing it. So that we must carefully distinguish continuance in opinion from obstinacy, confidence of understanding from peevishness of affection, a not being convinced from a resolution never to be convinced, upon human ends and vicious principles. *Scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare; sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud se semel sint usurpata retinere: qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus,* saith S. Cyprian[e]. And he himself was such a one, for he persisted in his opinion of rebaptization until death, and yet his obstinacy was not called criminal, or his error turned to heresy. But to return.

11. In this sense it is that a heretic is αὐτοκατάκριτος, 'self-condemned,' not by an immediate express sentence of understanding, but by his own act or fault brought into condemnation. As it is in the canon law, *Notorius percussor clerici* is *ipso jure* excommunicate, not *per sententiam latam ab homine,* but *a jure;* no man hath passed sentence *pro tribunali,* but law hath decreed it *pro edicto:* so it is in the case of a heretic. The understanding which is judge, condemns him not by an express sentence; for he errs with as much simplicity in the result as he had malice in the principle: but there is *sententia lata a jure;* his will which is his law, that hath condemned him. And this is gathered from that saying of S. Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 13, "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." First, they are evil men: malice and peevishness is in their wills; then they turn heretics, and seduce others; and while they grow worse and worse, the error is master of their

[e] Epist., lib. ii. 1. [al. ep. lxxii. p. 197 fin.]

understanding, they are deceived themselves, 'given over to believe a lie,' saith the apostle[f]: they first play the knave and then play the fool; they first sell themselves to the purchase of vain glory or ill ends, and then they become possessed with a lying spirit, and believe those things heartily which if they were honest they should with God's grace discover and disclaim. So that now we see that *bona fides in falso articulo*, 'a hearty persuasion in a false article,' does not always make the error to be esteemed involuntary, but then only when it is as innocent in the principle as it is confident in the present persuasion. And such persons who by their ill lives and vicious actions, or manifest designs (for "by their fruits ye shall know them[g]") give testimony of such criminal indispositions, so as competent judges by humane[h] and prudent estimate may so judge them, then they are to be declared heretics, and avoided. And if this were not true, it were vain that the apostle commands us to avoid a heretic: for no external act can pass upon a man for a crime that is not cognoscible.

12. Now every man that errs, though in a matter of consequence, so long as the foundation is entire, cannot be suspected justly guilty of a crime to give his error a formality of heresy; for we see many a good man miserably deceived, as we shall make it appear afterwards; and he that is the best amongst men certainly hath so much humility to think he may be easily deceived, and twenty to one but he is in some thing or other; yet if his error be not voluntary, and part of an ill life, then because he lives a good life, he is a good man, and therefore no heretic: no man is a heretic against his will. And if it be pretended that every man that is deceived is therefore proud, because he does not submit his understanding to the authority of God or man respectively, and so his error becomes a heresy; to this I answer, that there is no christian man but will submit his understanding to God, and believes whatsoever He hath said; but always provided he knows that God hath said so, else he must do his duty by a readiness to obey when he shall know it. But for obedience or humility of the understanding towards men, that is a thing of another consideration, and it must first be made evident that his understanding must be submitted to men; and who those men are must also be certain before it will be adjudged a sin not to submit. But if I mistake not, Christ's saying, "Call no man master upon earth[i]," is so great a prejudice against this pretence, as I doubt it will go near wholly to make it invalid. So that as the worshipping of angels is a humility indeed, but it is voluntary and a will-worship to an ill sense, not to be excused by the excellency of humility nor the virtue of religion: so is the relying upon the judgment of a man a humility too, but such as comes not under that ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, that 'obedience of

[f] [vid. 2 Thess. ii. 12.]
[g] [Matt. vii. 20.]
[h] ['humane' and 'human' are the same word in early editions.]
[i] [vid. Matt. xxiii. 8—10.]

faith,' which is the duty of every Christian; but intrenches upon that duty which we owe to Christ as an acknowledgment that He is our great Master, and the Prince of the catholic church. But whether it be or be not, if that be the question whether the disagreeing person be to be determined by the dictates of men, I am sure the dictates of men must not determine him in that question, but it must be settled by some higher principle: so that if of that question the disagreeing person does opine, or believe, or err *bona fide*, he is not therefore to be judged a heretic because he submits not his understanding; because till it be sufficiently made certain to him that he is bound to submit, he may innocently and piously disagree: and this not submitting is therefore not a crime, and so cannot make a heresy, because without a crime he may lawfully doubt whether he be bound to submit or no; for that's the question. And if in such questions which have influence upon a whole system of theology a man may doubt lawfully if he doubts heartily, because the authority of men being the thing in question, cannot be the judge of this question, and therefore being rejected, or (which is all one) being questioned, that is, not believed, cannot render the doubting person guilty of pride, and by consequence not of heresy; much more may particular questions be doubted of, and the authority of men examined, and yet the doubting person be humble enough, and therefore no heretic for all this pretence. And it would be considered that humility is a duty in great ones as well as in idiots. And as inferiors must not disagree without reason, so neither must superiors prescribe to others without sufficient authority, evidence, and necessity too: and if rebellion be pride, so is tyranny; and it being *in materia intellectuali*, both may be guilty of pride of understanding, sometimes the one in imposing, sometimes the other in a causeless disagreeing; but in the inferiors it is then only the want of humility when the guides impose or prescribe what God hath also taught; and then it is the disobeying God's dictates, not man's, that makes the sin. But then this consideration will also intervene, that as no dictate of God obliges men to believe it unless I know it to be such, so neither will any of the dictates of my superiors engage my faith unless I also know, or have no reason to disbelieve but that they are warranted to teach them to me; therefore, because God hath taught the same to them, which if I once know, or have no reason to think the contrary, if I disagree, my sin is not in resisting human authority but divine. And therefore the whole business of submitting our understanding to human authority comes to nothing; for either it resolves into the direct duty of submitting to God, or if it be spoken of abstractly[1] it is no duty at all.

13. But this pretence of a necessity of humbling the understanding is none of the meanest arts whereby some persons have invaded, and usurped a power over men's faith and consciences, and therefore we shall examine the pretence afterwards, and try if God

[1] ['abstractedly,' B, C.]

hath invested any man or company of men with such a power. In the mean time, he that submits his understanding to all that he knows God hath said, and is ready to submit to all that He hath said if he but know it, denying his own affections, and ends, and interests, and human persuasions, laying them all down at the foot of his great Master Jesus Christ, that man hath brought his understanding into subjection, and every proud thought unto the obedience of Christ, and this is ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, 'the obedience of faith,' which is the duty of a Christian.

14. But to proceed: Besides these heresies noted in scripture, the age of the apostles and that which followed was infested with other heresies, but such as had the same formality and malignity with the precedent, all of them either such as taught practical impieties or denied an article of the creed. Hegesippus in Eusebius[k] reckons seven only prime heresies that sought to deflower the purity of the church; that of Simon, that of Thebutes, of Cleobius, of Dositheus, of Gortheus, of Masbotheus; I suppose Cerinthus to have been the seventh man, though he express him not: but of these, except the last, we know no particulars, but that Hegesippus says they were false Christs, and that their doctrine was directly against God and His blessed Son. Menander also was the first of a sect, but he bewitched the people with his sorceries. Cerinthus his doctrine pretended enthusiasm or a new revelation, and ended in lust and impious theorems in matter of uncleanness. The Ebionites[l] denied Christ to be the Son of God, and affirmed Him ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον, begot by natural generation (by occasion of which and the importunity of the Asian bishops S. John writ his gospel) and taught the observation of Moses' law. Basilides taught it lawful to renounce the faith and take false oaths in time of persecution. Carpocrates was a very bedlam, half-witch, and quite madman; and practised lust, which he called the secret operations to overcome the potentates of the world. Some more there were, but of the same nature and pest, not of a nicety in dispute, not a question of secret philosophy, not of atoms and undiscernible propositions, but open defiances of all faith, of all sobriety, and of all sanctity; excepting only the doctrine of the Millenaries, which in the best ages was esteemed no heresy but true catholic doctrine, though since it hath justice done to it, and hath suffered a just condemnation.

15. Hitherto, and in these instances, the church did esteem and judge of heresies in proportion to the rules and characters of faith. For faith being a doctrine of piety as well as truth, that which was either destructive of fundamental verity or of christian sanctity, was against faith, and if it made a sect was heresy; if not, it ended in personal impiety, and went no further. But those who, as S. Paul[m] says, 'not only did such things, but had pleasure in them that do them,' and therefore taught others to do what they impiously did

[k] [Hist. eccles. iv. 22. p. 182 sq.] col. 779.]
[l] Vid. Hilar., lib. i. de Trin. [§ 26. [m] [Rom. i. 31.]

dogmatize, they were heretics both in matter and form, in doctrine and deportment, towards God and towards man, and judicable in both tribunals.

16. But the scripture and apostolical sermons, having expressed most high indignation against these masters of impious sects, leaving them under prodigious characters and horrid representments, as calling them 'men of corrupt minds,' 'reprobates concerning the faith,' 'given over to strong delusions to the belief of a lie,' 'false apostles,' 'false prophets,' men 'already condemned' and that 'by themselves,' 'antichrists,' 'enemies of God;' and heresy itself 'a work of the flesh,' 'excluding from the kingdom of heaven;' left such impressions in the minds of all their successors, and so much zeal against such sects, that if any opinion commenced in the church not heard of before, it oftentimes had this ill luck to run the same fortune with an old heresy. For because the heretics did bring in new opinions in matters of great concernment, every opinion *de novo* brought in was liable to the same exception; and because the degree of malignity in every error was oftentimes undiscernible, and most commonly indemonstrable, their zeal was alike against all; and those ages being full of piety were fitted to be abused with an over active zeal, as wise persons and learned are with a too much indifferency.

17. But it came to pass that the further the succession went from the apostles, the more forward men were in numbering heresies, and that upon slighter and more uncertain grounds. Some footsteps of this we shall find, if we consider the sects that are said to have sprung in the first three hundred years, and they were pretty and quick in their springs and falls; fourscore and seven of them are reckoned. They were indeed reckoned afterward; and though when they were alive they were not condemned with as much forwardness as after they were dead, yet even then confidence began to mingle with opinions less necessary, and mistakes in judgment were oftener and more public than they should have been. But if they were forward in their censures (as sometimes some of them were) it is no great wonder they were deceived. For what principle or κριτήριον had they then to judge of heresies or condemn them, besides the single dictates or decretals of private bishops? for scripture was indifferently pretended by all, and concerning the meaning of it was the question: now there was no general council all that while, no opportunity for the church to convene; and if we search the communicatory letters of the bishops and martyrs in those days, we shall find but few sentences decretory concerning any question of faith, or new sprung opinion. And in those that did, for aught appears the persons were misreported or their opinions mistaken, or at most the sentence of condemnation was no more but this; such a bishop who hath had the good fortune by posterity to be reputed a catholic did condemn such a man of such an opinion, and yet himself erred in as considerable matters, but meeting with better neighbours in his life-time and

a more charitable posterity, hath his memory preserved in honour. It appears plain enough in the case of Nicholas the deacon of Antioch, upon a mistake of his words whereby he taught παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκὶ, 'to abuse the flesh,' viz., by acts of austerity and self-denial and mortification; some wicked people that were glad to be mistaken and abused into a pleasing crime pretended that he taught them to abuse the flesh by filthy commixtures and pollutions. This mistake was transmitted to posterity with a full cry, and acts afterwards found out to justify an ill opinion of him: for by S. Hierome's time it grew out of question but that he was the vilest of men and the worst of heretics; *Nicolaus Antiochenus omnium immunditiarum conditor*[n] *choros duxit fœmineos*[o], and again, *Iste Nicolaus diaconus ita immundus exstitit ut etiam in præsepi Domini nefas perpetrarit*[p]: accusations that while the good man lived were never thought of; for his daughters were virgins, and his sons lived in holy celibate all their lives, and himself lived in chaste wedlock; and yet his memory had rotted in perpetual infamy, had not God (in whose sight the memory of the saints is precious) preserved it by the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus[q], and from him of Eusebius[r] and Nicephorus[s]: but in the catalogue of heretics made by Philastrius[t] he stands marked with a black character, as guilty of many heresies; by which one testimony we may guess what trust is to be given to those catalogues. Well, this good man had ill luck to fall into unskilful hands at first; but Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Lactantius, (to name no more) had better fortune; for it being still extant in their writings that they were of the millenary opinion, Papias before, and Nepos after, were censured hardly, and the opinion put into the catalogue of heresies; and yet these men never suspected as guilty, but like the children of the captivity, walked in the midst of the flame, and not so much as the smell of fire passed on them. But the uncertainty of these things is very memorable in the story of Eustathius bishop of Antioch, contesting with Eusebius Pamphilus: Eustathius accused Eusebius for going about to corrupt the Nicene Creed, of which slander he then acquitted himself, saith Socrates[u]; and yet he is not cleared by posterity, for still he is suspected, and his fame not clear; however, Eusebius then scaped well, but to be quit with his adversary he recriminates, and accuses him to be 'a favourer of Sabellius rather than of the Nicene canons;' an imperfect accusation, God knows, when the crime was a suspicion, proveable only by actions capable of divers constructions, and at the most made but some degrees of probability; and the fact itself did not consist

[n] [leg. 'repertor.']
[o] Ad Ctesiph. [ep. xliii. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 477.]
[p] Epist. de Fabiano [leg. 'Sabiniano.'] lapso. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 747. But the act is attributed, not to Nicholas, but to Sabinianus.]
[q] Lib. iii. Stromat. [cap. 4. p. 523. Vid. etiam, lib. ii. cap. 20. p. 491.]
[r] Lib. iii. c. 26. [al. 29. p. 123.]
[s] [lib. iii. c. 15. tom. i. p. 244.]
[t] [cap. xxxiii. p. 70.]
[u] Lib. i. cap. 23. [p. 58. Socrates only says that Eusebius denied the charge.]

in indivisibili, and therefore was to stand or fall, to be improved or lessened, according to the will of the judges, whom in this cause Eustathius by his ill fortune and a potent adversary found harsh towards him, insomuch that he was for heresy deposed in the synod of Antioch; and though this was laid open in the eye of the world, as being most ready at hand, with the greatest ease charged upon every man, and with greatest difficulty acquitted by any man; yet there were other suspicions raised upon him privately, or at least talked of *ex post facto,* and pretended as causes of his deprivation, lest the sentence should seem too hard for the first offence. And yet what they were no man could tell, saith the story. But it is observable what Socrates[x] saith, as an excuse of such proceedings, Τοῦτο δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων εἰώθασι τῶν καθαιρουμένων ποιεῖν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, κατηγοροῦντες μὲν καὶ ἀσεβῆ[y] λέγοντες, τὰς δὲ αἰτίας τῆς ἀσεβείας οὐ λέγουσιν· 'it is the manner among the bishops, when they accuse them that are deposed, they call them wicked, but they publish not the actions of their impiety.' It might possibly be that the bishops did it in tenderness of their reputation, but yet hardly; for to punish a person publicly and highly is a certain declaring the person punished guilty of a high crime, and then to conceal the fault upon pretence to preserve his reputation leaves every man at liberty to conjecture what he pleaseth; who possibly will believe it worse than it is, inasmuch as they think his judges so charitable as therefore to conceal the fault lest the publishing of it should be his greatest punishment, and the scandal greater than his deprivation. However, this course[z], if it were just in any, was unsafe in all; for it might undo more than it could preserve, and therefore is of more danger than it can be of charity. It is therefore too probable that the matter was not very fair; for in public sentences the acts ought to be public, but that they rather pretend heresy to bring their ends about shews how easy it is to impute that crime, and how forward they were to do it: and that they might and did then as easily call heretic as afterward, when Vigilius was condemned of heresy for saying there were antipodes; or as the friars of late did, who suspected Greek and Hebrew of heresy, and called their professors heretics, and had like to have put Terence and Demosthenes into the *Index Expurgatorius;* sure enough they railed at them *pro concione,* therefore because they understood them not, and had reason to believe they would accidentally be enemies to their reputation among the people.

18. By this instance which was a while after the Nicene council, where the acts of the church were regular, judicial, and orderly, we may guess at the sentences passed upon heresy at such times and in such cases when their process was more private and their acts more tumultuary, their information less certain, and therefore their mis-

[x] Lib. i. cap. 24. [ibid.]

[y] [leg. ἀσεβεῖν, . . οὐ προστιθέντες.]

[z] Simpliciter pateat vitium fortasse pusillum;
Quod tegitur, majus creditur esse malum.—Mart. [iii. 42.]

takes more easy and frequent. And it is remarkable in the case of the heresy of Montanus, the scene of whose heresy lay within the first three hundred years, though it was represented in the catalogues afterwards, and possibly the mistake concerning it is to be put upon the score of Epiphanius, by whom Montanus and his followers were put into the catalogue of heretics for commanding abstinence from meats, as if they were unclean and of themselves unlawful. Now the truth was Montanus said no such thing; but commanded frequent abstinence, enjoined dry diet, and an ascetic table, not for conscience' sake but for discipline; and yet because he did this with too much rigour and strictness of mandate, the primitive church misliked it in him, as being too near their error who by a Judaical superstition abstained from meats as from uncleanness. This by the way will much concern them who place too much sanctity in such rites and acts of discipline; for it is an eternal rule and of never-failing truth, that such abstinences, if they be obtruded as acts of original immediate duty and sanctity, are unlawful and superstitious; if they be for discipline, they may be good, but of no very great profit; it is that ἀφελία τοῦ σώματος which S. Paul[a] says profiteth but little; and just in the same degree the primitive church esteemed them; for they therefore reprehended Montanus for urging such abstinences with too much earnestness, though but in the way of discipline; for that it was no more, Tertullian[b], who was himself a Montanist, and knew best the opinions of his own sect, testifies; and yet Epiphanius[c], reporting the errors of Montanus, commends that which Montanus truly and really taught, and which the primitive church condemned in him; and therefore represents that heresy to another sense, and affixes that to Montanus which Epiphanius believed a heresy, and yet which Montanus did not teach. And this also among many other things lessens my opinion very much of the integrity or discretion of the old catalogues of heretics, and much abates my confidence towards them.

19. And now that I have mentioned them casually in passing by, I shall give a short account of them; for men are much mistaken; some in their opinions concerning the truth of them, as believing them to be all true; some concerning their purpose, as thinking them sufficient not only to condemn all those opinions there called heretical, but to be a precedent to all ages of the church to be free and forward in calling heretic. But he that considers the catalogues themselves as they are collected by Epiphanius, Philastrius, and S. Austin, shall find that many are reckoned for heretics for opinions in matters disputable, and undetermined, and of no consequence; and that in these catalogues of heretics there are men numbered for heretics which by every side respectively are acquitted; so that there is no company of men in the world that admit these catalogues as good records or sufficient sentences of condemnation. For the

[a] [1 Tim. iv. 8.] [b] [De jejun. passim, p. 545 sqq.]
[c] [Hær. xlviii. vol. i. p. 402 sqq.]

churches of the Reformation, I am certain they acquit Aerius for denying prayer for the dead, and the Eustathians for denying invocation of saints. And I am partly of opinion that the church of Rome is not willing to call the Collyridians heretics for offering a cake to the Virgin Mary, unless she also will run the hazard of the same sentence for offering candles to her; and that they will be glad with S. Austin (l. vi. *de Hæres.* c. 86.[d]) to excuse the Tertullianists[e] for picturing God in a visible corporal representment. And yet these sects are put in the black book by Epiphanius, and S. Austin, and Isidore respectively. I remember also that the *Osseni* are called heretics because they refused to worship towards the east[f]; and yet in that dissent I find not the malignity of a heresy, nor any thing against an article of faith or good manners; and it being only in circumstance, it were hard, if they were otherwise pious men and true believers, to send them to hell for such a trifle. The *Parermeneutæ* refused to follow other men's dictates like sheep, but would expound scripture according to the best evidence themselves could find, and yet were called heretics whether they expounded true or no. The *Pauliciani*[g] for being offended at crosses, the Proclians[h] for saying in a regenerate man all his sins were not quite dead but only curbed and assuaged, were called heretics, and so condemned; for aught I know for affirming that which all pious men feel in themselves to be too true. And he that will consider how numerous the catalogues are, and to what a volume they are come in their last collections, to no less than five hundred and twenty (for so many heresies and heretics are reckoned by Prateolus[i]) may think that if a retrenchment were justly made of truths, and all impertinencies, and all opinions either still disputable or less considerable, the number would much decrease; and therefore that the catalogues are much amiss, and the name heretic is made a *terriculamentum* to affright people from their belief, or to discountenance the persons of men, and disrepute them, that their schools may be empty and their disciples few.

20. So that I shall not need to instance how that some men were called heretics by Philastrius[j] for rejecting the translation of the LXX. and following the bible of Aquila, wherein the great faults mentioned by Philastrius are that he translates Χριστὸν Θεοῦ, not *Christum* but *unctum Dei*, and instead of *Emanuel* writes *Deus nobiscum*. But this most concerns them of the primitive church, with whom the translation of Aquila was in great reputation, *is enim veluti plus a quibusdam . . intellexisse laudatur*, 'it was supposed he was a great clerk and understood more than ordinary;' it may be so

[d] [leg. lib. de hæres., cap. 86. tom. vi. p. 14. ed. fol. Par. 1586. Ben. tom. viii. col. 24.]

[e] D. Thom. l. contra Gent., cap. 21. [leg. lib. i. cap. 20 fin.]

[f] [Not for this only; see Epiphan. hær. xix. § 3. p. 42.]

[g] Euthym. part. i. [leg. ii.] tit. 21. [p. 695. ed. 8vo. Par. 1556.]

[h] Epiph. Hæres. lxiv. [§ 25.—But their heresy was more than this.]

[i] [De vitis &c. hæreticorum, fol. Col. 1569.]

[j] [cap. cxxxviii. p. 301.]

he did. But whether yea or no, yet since the other translators by the confession of Philastrius *quædam prætermisisse necessitate urgente cogerentur*, if some wise men or unwise did follow a translator who understood the original well (for so Aquila had learnt amongst the Jews) it was hard to call men heretics for following his translation, especially since the other bibles (which were thought to have in them contradictories, and it was confessed had omitted some things) were excused by necessity, and the others' necessity of following Aquila when they had no better was not at all considered, nor a less crime than heresy laid upon their score[k]. Such another was the heresy of the *Quartodecimani;* for the Easterlings were all proclaimed heretics for keeping Easter after the manner of the East; and as Socrates[l] and Nicephorus[m] report, the bishop of Rome was very forward to excommunicate all the bishops of the Lesser Asia for observing the feast according to the tradition of their ancestors, though they did it modestly, quietly, and without faction; and although they pretended, and were as well able to prove their tradition from S. John of so observing it, as the western church could prove their tradition derivative from S. Peter and S. Paul. If such things as these make up the catalogues of heretics (as we see they did) their accounts differ from the precedents they ought to have followed, that is, the censures apostolical, and therefore are unsafe precedents for us; and unless they took the liberty of using the word heresy in a lower sense than the world now doth since the councils have been forward in pronouncing anathema, and took it only for a distinct sense and a differing persuasion in matters of opinion and minute articles, we cannot excuse the persons of the men: but if they intended the crime of heresy against those opinions as they laid them down in their catalogues, that crime, I say, which is a work of the flesh, which excludes from the kingdom of heaven, all that I shall say against them is that the causeless curse[n] shall return empty, and no man is damned the sooner because his enemy cries ὦ κατάρατε, and they that were the judges and accusers might err as well as the persons accused, and might need as charitable construction of their opinions and practices as the other. And of this we are sure, they had no warrant from any rule of scripture or practice apostolical, for driving so furiously and hastily in such decretory sentences. But I am willing rather to believe their sense of the word 'heresy' was more gentle than with us it is; and for that they might have warrant from scripture.

21. But by the way I observe that although these catalogues are a great instance to shew that they whose age and spirits were far distant from the apostles, had also other judgments concerning faith and heresy than the apostles had, and the ages apostolical; yet these

[k] Philast. xcix. [? xcviii. Sed vid. loc. et notas.] eos inter hæreticos numerat, qui 'spiraculum vitæ' in libro Genes. interpretantur 'animam rationalem,' et non potius 'gratiam Spiritus Sancti.'

[l] [lib. v. cap. 22.]

[m] [lib. iv. cap. 38. tom. i. p. 339.]

[n] [vid. Prov. xxvi. 2.]

catalogues, although they are reports of heresies in the second and third ages, are not to be put upon the account of those ages, nor to be reckoned as an instance of their judgment, which although it was in some degrees more culpable than that of their predecessors, yet in respect of the following ages it was innocent and modest. But these catalogues I speak of were set down according to the sense of the then present ages, in which as they in all probability did differ from the apprehensions of the former centuries, so it is certain there were differing learnings, other fancies, divers representments and judgments of men, depending upon circumstances which the first ages knew and the following ages did not; and therefore the catalogues were drawn with some truth but less certainty, as appears in their differing about the authors of some heresies; several opinions imputed to the same, and some put in the roll of heretics by one which the other left out; which to me is an argument that the collectors were determined not by the sense and sentence of the three first ages, but by themselves and some circumstances about them, which to reckon for heretics, which not; and that they themselves were the prime judges, or perhaps some in their own age, together with them; but there was not any sufficient external judicatory competent to declare heresy, that by any public or sufficient sentence or acts of court had furnished them with warrant for their catalogues. And therefore they are no argument sufficient that the first ages of the church, which certainly were the best, did much recede from that which I shewed to be the sense of the scripture and the practice of the apostles; they all contented themselves with the apostles' creed as the rule of the faith, and therefore were not forward to judge of heresy but by analogy to their rule of faith. And those catalogues made after these ages are not sufficient arguments that they did otherwise, but rather of the weakness of some persons, or of the spirit and genius of the age in which the compilers lived; in which the device of calling all differing opinions by the name of heresies might grow to be a design to serve ends and to promote interests, as often as an act of zeal and just indignation against evil persons, destroyers of the faith and corrupters of manners.

22. For whatever private men's opinions were, yet till the Nicene council the rule of faith was entire in the apostles' creed; and provided they retained that, easily they broke not the unity of faith, however differing opinions might possibly commence in such things in which a liberty were better suffered, than prohibited with a breach of charity. And this appears exactly in the question between S. Cyprian of Carthage and Stephen bishop of Rome; in which one instance it is easy to see what was lawful and safe for a wise and good man, and yet how others began even then to be abused by that temptation which since hath invaded all christendom. S. Cyprian rebaptized heretics, and thought he was bound so to do; calls a synod in Afric, as being metropolitan, and confirms his opinion by the consent

of his suffragans and brethren, but still with so much modesty that if any man was of another opinion he judged him not, but gave him that liberty that he desired himself. Stephen bishop of Rome grows angry, excommunicates the bishops of Asia and Africa that in divers synods had consented to rebaptization, and without peace, and without charity, condemns them for heretics. Indeed here was the rarest mixture and conjunction of unlikelihoods that I have observed. Here was error of opinion with much modesty and sweetness of temper, on one side, and on the other an over active and impetuous zeal to attest a truth. It uses not to be so; for error usually is supported with confidence, and truth suppressed and discountenanced by indifferency. But that it might appear that the error was not the sin but the uncharitableness, Stephen was accounted a zealous and furious person, and S. Cyprian, though deceived, yet a very good man and of great sanctity[o]. For although every error is to be opposed, yet according to the variety of errors so is there variety of proceedings. If it be against faith, that is, a destruction of any part of the foundation, it is with zeal to be resisted; and we have for it an apostolical warrant, 'contend earnestly for the faith[p]:' but then as these things recede further from the foundation, our certainty is the less, and their necessity not so much; and therefore it were very fit that our confidence should be according to our evidence, and our zeal according to our confidence, and our confidence should then be the rule of our communion, and the lightness of an article should be considered with the weight of a precept of charity. And therefore there are some errors to be reproved rather by a private friend than a public censure, and the persons of the men not avoided but admonished; and their doctrine rejected, not their communion. Few opinions are of that malignity which are to be rejected with the same exterminating spirit and confidence of aversation with which the first teachers of christianity condemned Ebion, Manes, and Cerinthus; and in the condemnation of heretics, the personal iniquity is more considerable than the obliquity of the doctrine, not for the rejection of the article, but for censuring the persons; and therefore it is the piety of the man that excused S. Cyprian; which is a certain argument that it is not the opinion but the impiety that condemns and makes the heretic. And this was it which Vincentius Lirinensis[q] said in this very case of S. Cyprian, *Unius et ejusdem opinionis (mirum videri potest) judicamus auctores catholicos et sequaces hæreticos; excusamus magistros et condemnamus scholasticos; qui scripserunt libros sunt hæredes cœli quorum librorum defensores detruduntur ad infernum.* Which saying if we confront against the saying of Salvian[r], condemning the first authors of the Arian sect and acquitting the followers, we are taught by these two wise men that an error is not it that sends a man to

[o] Vide S. Aug., lib. ii. c. 6. de Bapt. contra Donat. [tom. ix. col. 100.]

[p] [Jude 3.]

[q] Adv. hær., cap. xi. [al. cap. vi. p. 105 D.]

[r] [vid. De gubern. Dei, lib. v. p. 86.]

hell; but he that begins the heresy and is the author of the sect, he is the man marked out to ruin; and his followers scaped, when the heresiarch commenced the error upon pride and ambition, and his followers went after him in simplicity of their heart; and so it was most commonly: but on the contrary when the first man in the opinion was honestly and invincibly deceived, as S. Cyprian was, and that his scholars to maintain their credit, or their ends, maintained the opinion, not for the excellency of the reason persuading, but for the benefit and accruements, or peevishness, as did the Donatists, *qui de Cypriani auctoritate sibi carnaliter blandiuntur*, as S. Austin[a] said of them; then the scholars are the heretics, and the master is a catholic; for his error is not the heresy formally, and an erring person may be a catholic. A wicked person in his error becomes heretic, when the good man in the same error shall have all the rewards of faith. For whatever an ill man believes, if he therefore believe it because it serves his own ends, be his belief true or false, the man hath an heretical mind, for to serve his own ends his mind is prepared to believe a lie. But a good man that believes what according to his light, and upon the use of his moral industry, he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or no, because he hath a mind desirous of truth and prepared to believe every truth, is therefore acceptable to God because nothing hindered him from it but what he could not help, his misery and his weakness, which being imperfections merely natural, which God never punishes, he stands fair for a blessing of his morality, which God always accepts. So that now if Stephen had followed the example of God almighty, or retained but the same peaceable spirit which his brother of Carthage did, he might with more advantage to truth, and reputation both of wisdom and piety, have done his duty in attesting what he believed to be true; for we are as much bound to be zealous pursuers of peace, as earnest contenders for the faith. I am sure more earnest we ought to be for the peace of the church, than for an article which is not of the faith, as this question of rebaptization was not; for S. Cyprian died in belief against it, and yet was a catholic, and a martyr for the christian faith.

23. The sum is this: S. Cyprian did right in a wrong cause (as it hath been since judged) and Stephen did ill in a good cause; as far then as piety and charity is to be preferred before a true opinion, so far is S. Cyprian's practice a better precedent for us, and an example of primitive sanctity, than the zeal and indiscretion of Stephen; S. Cyprian had not learned to forbid to any one a liberty of prophesying or interpretation, if he transgressed not the foundation of faith and the creed of the apostles.

24. Well, thus it was, and thus it ought to be, in the first ages; the faith of christendom rested still upon the same foundation, and the judgments of heresies were accordingly, or were amiss; but the first

[a] [De bapt. contr. Donat., lib. i. cap. 18. tom. ix. col. 93 F.]

great violation of this truth was when general councils came in, and the symbols were enlarged, and new articles were made as much of necessity to be believed as the creed of the apostles, and damnation threatened to them that did dissent; and at last the creeds multiplied in number and in articles, and the liberty of prophesying began to be something restrained.

25. And this was of so much the more force and efficacy because it began upon great reason, and in the first instance with success good enough. For I am much pleased with the enlarging of the creed which the council of Nice made, because they enlarged it to my sense: but I am not sure that others are satisfied with it. While we look upon the article they did determine, we see all things well enough; but there are some wise personages consider it in all circumstances, and think the church had been more happy if she had not been in some sense constrained to alter the simplicity of her faith, and make it more curious and articulate, so much that he had need be a subtle man to understand the very words of the new determinations.

26. For the first Alexander bishop of Alexandria, in the presence of his clergy, entreats[t] somewhat more curiously of the secret of the mysterious Trinity and Unity; so curiously that Arius (who was a sophister too subtle as it afterwards appeared) misunderstood him, and thought he intended to bring in the heresy of Sabellius. For while he taught the unity of the Trinity, either he did it so inartificially, or so intricately, that Arius thought he did not distinguish the Persons, when the bishop intended only the unity of nature. Against this Arius furiously drives; and to confute Sabellius, and in him (as he thought) the bishop, distinguishes the natures too, and so to secure the article of the Trinity destroys the Unity. It was the first time the question was disputed in the world, and in such mysterious niceties possibly every wise man may understand something, but few can understand all, and therefore suspect what they understand not, and are furiously zealous for that part of it which they do perceive. Well, it happened in these as always in such cases, in things men understand not they are most impetuous; and because suspicion is a thing infinite in degrees, for it hath nothing to determine it, a suspicious person is ever most violent; for his fears are worse than the thing feared, because the thing is limited but his fears are not; so that upon this grew contentions on both sides, and tumults[u], railing and reviling each other; and then the laity were drawn into parts, and the Meletians abetted the wrong part; and the right part, fearing to be overborne, did any thing that was next at hand to secure itself[v]. Now then they that lived in that age, that understood the men, that saw how quiet the church was before this stir, how miserably rent now, what little benefit from the question, what schism about it, gave other censures of the business than we since have done,

[t] Socrat., lib. i. [c. 5.] [u] ['tumultuous' B, C.] [v] [Socr.] lib. i. c. 6. [p. 14.]

who only look upon the article determined with truth and approbation of the church generally since that time. But the epistle[w] of Constantine to Alexander and Arius tells the truth, and chides them both for commencing the question, Alexander for broaching it, Arius for taking it up. And although this be true, that it had been better for the church it never had begun, yet being begun what is to be done in it? Of this also in that admirable epistle we have the emperor's judgment (I suppose not without the advice and privity of Hosius bishop of Corduba, whom the emperor loved and trusted much, and employed in the delivery of the letters:) for first he calls it "a certain vain piece of a question, ill begun, and more unadvisedly published; a question which no law or ecclesiastical canon defineth; a fruitless contention, the product of idle brains; a matter so nice, so obscure, so intricate, that it was neither to be explicated by the clergy nor understood by the people: a dispute of words, a doctrine inexplicable, but most dangerous when taught lest it introduce discord or blasphemy; and therefore the objector was rash, and the answerer unadvised; for it concerned not the substance of faith, or the worship of God, nor any chief commandment of scripture; and therefore why should it be the matter of discord? for though the matter be grave, yet because neither necessary nor explicable, the contention is trifling and toyish. And therefore as the philosophers of the same sect, though differing in explication of an opinion, yet more love for the unity of their profession than disagree for the difference of opinion; so should Christians, believing in the same God, retaining the same faith, having the same hopes, opposed by the same enemies, not fall at variance upon such disputes, considering our understandings are not all alike, and therefore neither can our opinions in such mysterious articles. So that the matter being of no great importance, but vain and a toy[x] in respect of the excellent blessings of peace and charity, it were good that Alexander and Arius should leave contending, keep their opinions to themselves, ask each other forgiveness, and give mutual toleration." This is the substance of Constantine's letter; and it contains in it much reason, if he did not undervalue the question; but it seems it was not then thought a question of faith, but of nicety ~~of dispute~~; they both did believe one God, and the holy Trinity. Now then that he afterward called the Nicene council, it was upon occasion of the vileness of the men of the Arian part, their eternal discord and pertinacious wrangling, and to bring peace into the church: that was the necessity, and in order to it was the determination of the article. But for the article itself, the letter declares what opinion he had of that; and this letter was by Socrates called "a wonderful exhortation, full of grave and sober counsels," and such as Hosius himself, who was the messenger, pressed with all earnestness, with all the skill and authority he had.

27. I know the opinion the world had of the article afterward is

[w] [Ibid.] cap. 7. [p. 15.] [x] [sed vid. Bull. Defens. fid. Nicæn. § 2. cap. 1.]

quite differing from this censure given of it before; and therefore they have put it into the creed, I suppose, to bring the world to unity, and to prevent sedition in this question, and the accidental blasphemies which were occasioned by their curious talkings of such secret mysteries, and by their illiterate resolutions. But although the article was determined with an excellent spirit, and we all with much reason profess to believe it, yet it is another consideration whether or no it might not have been better determined if with more simplicity; and another yet, whether or no, since many of the bishops who did believe this thing yet did not like the nicety and curiosity of expressing it, it had not been more agreeable to the practice of the apostles to have made a determination of the article by way of exposition of the apostles' creed, and to have left this in a rescript for record to all posterity, and not to have enlarged the creed with it; for since it was an explication of an article of the creed of the apostles as sermons are of places of scripture, it was thought by some that scripture might with good profit and great truth be expounded, and yet the expositions not put into the canon or go for scripture, but that left still in the naked original simplicity; and so much the rather since that explication was further from the foundation, and though most certainly true, yet not penned by so infallible a spirit as was that of the apostles, and therefore not with so much evidence as certainty. And if they had pleased they might have made use of an admirable precedent to this and many other great and good purposes, no less than of the blessed apostles, whose symbol they might have imitated, with as much simplicity as they did the expressions of scripture when they first composed it. For it is most considerable that although in reason every clause in the creed should be clear, and so inopportune and unapt to variety of interpretation that there might be no place left for several senses or variety of expositions; yet when they thought fit to insert some mysteries into the creed which in scripture were expressed in so mysterious words that the last and most explicit sense would still be latent; yet they who (if ever any did) understood all the senses and secrets of it, thought it not fit to use any words but the words of scripture, particularly in the articles of Christ's 'descending into hell,' and 'sitting at the right hand of God,' to shew us that those creeds are best which keep the very words of scripture; and that faith is best which hath greatest simplicity; and that it is better in all cases humbly to submit, than curiously to enquire and pry into the mystery under the cloud, and to hazard our faith by improving our knowledge. If the Nicene fathers had done so too, possibly the church would never have repented it.

28. And indeed the experience the church had afterwards, shewed that the bishops and priests were not satisfied in all circumstances, nor the schism appeased, nor the persons agreed, nor the canons accepted, nor the article understood, nor any thing right, but when

they were overborne with authority; which authority when the scales turned did the same service and promotion to the contrary.

29. But it is considerable that it was not the article or the thing itself that troubled the disagreeing persons, but the manner of representing it. For the five dissenters, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Maris, Theonas, and Secundus, believed Christ to be very God of very God: but the clause of ὁμοούσιος they derided, as being persuaded by their logic that He was neither 'of the substance of the Father' by division, as a piece of a lump; nor derivation, as children from their parents; nor by production, as buds from trees; and nobody could tell them any other way at that time, and that made the fire to burn still. And that was it I said; if the article had been with more simplicity and less nicety determined, charity would have gained more, and faith would have lost nothing. And we shall find the wisest of them all, for so Eusebius Pamphilus[x] was esteemed, published a creed or confession in the synod; and though he and all the rest believed that great mystery of godliness, 'God manifested in the flesh,' yet he was not fully satisfied, nor so soon, of the clause of 'one substance,' till he had done a little violence to his own understanding; for even when he had subscribed to the clause of 'one substance,' he does it with a protestation, that 'heretofore he never had been acquainted, nor accustomed himself to such speeches.' And the sense of the word was either so ambiguous, or their meaning so uncertain, that Andreas Fricius does, with some probability, dispute that the Nicene fathers by ὁμοούσιος did mean *Patris similitudinem, non essentiæ unitatem*, Sylva iv. c. 1[y]. And it was so well understood by personages disinterested, that when Arius and Euzoius[z] had confessed Christ to be *Deus verbum*, without inserting the clause of 'one substance,' the emperor by his letter approved of his faith, and restored him to his country and office and the communion of the church. And a long time after although the article was believed with nicety enough[a], yet when they added more words still to the mystery, and brought in the word ὑπόστασις, saying there were three *hypostases* in the holy Trinity; it was so long before it could be understood, that it was believed therefore because they would not oppose their superiors, or disturb the peace of the church, in things which they thought could not be understood: insomuch that S. Hierome[b] wrote to Damasus in these words, *Decerne, si placet, obsecro, non timebo tres hypostases dicere, si jubetis:* and again, *Obtestor beatitudinem tuam per crucifixum, mundi salutem, per ὁμοούσιον Trinitatem, ut mihi epistolis tuis sive tacendarum sive dicendarum hypostaseon detur auctoritas.*

[x] Vide Sozomen., lib. ii. c. 18. [p. 68.]

[y] [p. 225.—4to. 1590.]

[z] Socrates, lib. i. c. 26. [p. 61.]

[a] Non imprudenter dixit qui curiosæ explicationi hujus mysterii dictum Aristonis philosophi applicuit, Helleborus niger si crassius sumatur purgat et sanat, quum autem teritur et comminuitur suffocat.

[b] [vid. ep. xiv. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 20 sq.]

[c]

30. But without all question, the fathers determined the question with much truth; though I cannot say the arguments upon which they built their decrees were so good as the conclusion itself was certain. But that which in this case is considerable is, whether or no they did well in putting a curse to the foot of their decree, and the decree itself into the symbol, as if it had been of the same necessity? For the curse, Eusebius Pamphilus could hardly find in his heart to subscribe; at last he did, but with this clause, That he subscribed it because the form of curse did only 'forbid men to acquaint themselves with foreign speeches and unwritten languages,' whereby confusion and discord is brought into the church. So that it was not so much a magisterial high assertion of the article, as an endeavour to secure the peace of the church. And to the same purpose for aught I know, the fathers composed a form of confession, not as a prescript rule of faith to build the hopes of our salvation on, but as a *tessera* of that communion which by public authority was therefore established upon those articles, because the articles were true, though not of prime necessity; and because that unity of confession was judged, as things then stood, the best preserver of the unity of minds.

31. But I shall observe this, that although the Nicene fathers in that case, at that time, and in that conjuncture of circumstances did well (and yet their approbation is made by after ages *ex post facto*) yet if this precedent had been followed by all councils (and certainly they had equal power if they had thought it equally reasonable) and that they had put all their decrees into the creed, as some have done since, to what a volume had the creed by this time swelled? and all the house had run into foundation, nothing left for superstructures. But that they did not, it appears, [1] that since they thought all their decrees true, yet they did not think them all necessary, at least not in that degree, and that they published such decrees, they did it *declarando* not *imperando*, as doctors in their chairs, not masters of other men's faith and consciences. [2] And yet there is some more modesty, or wariness, or necessity (what shall I call it?) than this comes to: for why are not all controversies determined? But even when general assemblies of prelates have been, some controversies that have been very vexatious have been pretermitted, and others of less consequence have been determined. Why did never any general council condemn in express sentence the Pelagian heresy, that great pest, that subtle infection of christendom? and yet divers general councils did assemble while the heresy was in the world. Both these cases in several degrees leave men in their liberty of believing and prophesying. The latter proclaims that all controversies cannot be determined to sufficient purposes; and the first declares that those that are, are not all of them matters of faith; and themselves are not so secure but they may be deceived; and therefore possibly it were better it were let alone; for if the latter leaves them divided in their opinions,

yet their communions, and therefore probably their charities are not divided; but the former divides their communions, and hinders their interest; and yet for aught is certain, the accused person is the better catholic. And yet after all this it is not safety enough to say, 'Let the council or prelates determine articles warily, seldom, with great caution, and with much sweetness and modesty.' For though this be better than to do it rashly, frequently, and furiously; yet if we once transgress the bounds set us by the apostles in their creed, and not only preach other truths, but determine them *pro tribunali* as well as *pro cathedra*, although there be no error in the subject matter (as in Nice there was none) yet if the next ages say they will determine another article with as much care and caution, and pretend as great a necessity, there is no hindering them but by giving reasons against it; and so like enough they might have done against the decreeing the article at Nice; yet that[c] is not sufficient; for since the authority of the Nicene council hath grown to the height of a mountainous prejudice against him that should say it was ill done, the same reason and the same necessity may be pretended by any age and in any council; and they think themselves warranted by the great precedent at Nice to proceed as peremptorily as they did; but then if any other assembly of learned men may possibly be deceived, were it not better they should spare the labour, than that they should with so great pomp and solemnities engage men's persuasions, and determine an article which after ages must rescind; for therefore most certainly in their own age the point with safety of faith and salvation might have been disputed and disbelieved: and that many men's faiths have been tied up by acts and decrees of councils for those articles in which the next age did see a liberty had better been preserved, because an error was determined, we shall afterwards receive a more certain account.

32. And therefore the council of Nice did well, and Constantinople did well, so did Ephesus and Chalcedon; but it is because the articles were truly determined (for that is part of my belief) but who is sure it should be so beforehand? and whether the points there determined were necessary or no to be believed or to be determined, if peace had been concerned in it through the faction and division of the parties, I suppose the judgment of Constantine the emperor and the famous Hosius of Corduba is sufficient to instruct us, whose authority I rather urge than reasons, because it is a prejudice and not a reason I am to contend against.

33. So that such determinations and publishing of confessions with authority of prince and bishop are sometimes of very good use for the peace of the church; and they are good also to determine the judgment of indifferent persons, whose reasons of either side are not too great to weigh down the probability of that authority: but for persons of confident and imperious understandings, they on whose

[c] ['that this' B, C.]

side the determination is are armed with a prejudice against the other, and with a weapon to affront them, but with no more to convince them; and they against whom the decision is do the more readily betake themselves to the defensive, and are engaged upon contestation and public enmities, for such articles which either might safely have been unknown, or with much charity disputed. Therefore the Nicene council although it have the advantage of an acquired and prescribing authority, yet it must not become a precedent to others: lest the inconveniences of multiplying more articles upon as great pretence of reason as then, make the act of the Nicene fathers in straitening prophesying, and enlarging the creed, become accidentally an inconvenience. The first restraint, although if it had been complained of, might possibly have been better considered of, yet the inconvenience is not visible till it comes by way of precedent to usher in more. It is like an arbitrary power, which although by the same reason it take sixpence[d] from the subject it may take a hundred pounds, and then a thousand, and then all, yet so long as it is within the first bounds the inconvenience is not so great; but when it comes to be a precedent or argument for more, then the first may justly be complained of, as having in it that reason in the principle which brought the inconvenience in the sequel; and we have seen very ill consequents from innocent beginnings.

34. And the inconveniences which might possibly arise from this precedent those wise personages also did foresee; and therefore although they took liberty in Nice to add some articles, or at least more explicitly to declare the first creed, yet they then would have all the world to rest upon that and go no further, as believing that to be sufficient. S. Athanasius[e] declares their opinion, Ἡ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογηθεῖσα πίστις αὐτάρκης ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν μὲν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύστασιν δὲ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεως· 'that faith which the fathers there confessed, was sufficient for the refutation of all impiety and the establishment of all faith in Christ and true religion.' And therefore there was a famous epistle[f] written by Zeno the emperor, called the Ἑνωτικὸν, or the 'epistle of reconciliation,' in which all disagreeing interests are entreated to agree in the Nicene symbol, and a promise made upon that condition to communicate with all other sects, adding withal, that the church should never receive any other symbol than that which was composed by the Nicene fathers. And however Honorius was condemned for a monothelite, yet in one of the epistles which the sixth synod alleged against him, viz., the second, he gave them counsel that would have done the church as much service as the determination of the article did; for he advised them not to be curious in their disputings nor dogmatical in their determinations

[d] [See Clarendon, of the 'Shipmoney.' Hist. Rebell. bk. i.]

[e] Epist. ad Epict. [init. tom. i. p. 901 A.]

[f] Evagr., lib. iii. c. 14. [p. 345.]

about that question; and because the church was not used to dispute in that question, it were better to preserve the simplicity of faith than to ensnare men's consciences by a new article. And when the emperor Constantius was by his faction engaged in a contrary practice, the inconvenience and unreasonableness was so great that a prudent heathen observed and noted it in this character of Constantius, *Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem* [N.B.] *anili superstitione confudit; in qua scrutanda perplexius quam in componenda gratius, excitavit dissidia, quæ progressa fusius, aluit concertatione verborum, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conatur arbitrium.*

35. And yet men are more led by example than either by reason or by precept; for in the council of Constantinople one article *de novo et integro* was added, viz., "I believe one baptism for the remission of sins:" and then again they were so confident that that confession of faith was so absolutely entire, and that no man ever after should need to add any thing to the integrity of faith, that the fathers of the council of Ephesus pronounced anathema to all those that should add any thing to the creed of Constantinople. And yet for all this the church of Rome in a synod at Gentilly[g] added the clause of *Filioque* to the article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and what they have done since, all the world knows. *Exempla non consistunt, sed quamvis in tenuem recepta tramitem, latissime evagandi sibi faciunt potestatem.* All men were persuaded that it was most reasonable the limits of faith should be no more enlarged, but yet they enlarged it themselves, and bound others from doing it: like an intemperate father, who because he knows he does ill himself, enjoins temperance to his son, but continues to be intemperate himself.

36. But now if I should be questioned concerning the symbol of Athanasius[h] (for we see the Nicene symbol was the father of many more, some twelve or thirteen symbols in the space of a hundred years) I confess I cannot see that moderate sentence and gentleness of charity in his preface and conclusion as there was in the Nicene creed. Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly, unless the article of the Trinity be believed as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explained[i]. Indeed Athanasius had been soundly vexed on one side, and much cried up on the other; and therefore it is not so much wonder for him to be so decretory and severe in his censure; for nothing could more ascertain his friends to him, and disrepute his enemies, than the belief of that damnatory appendix; but that does not justify the thing. For the articles themselves, I am most heartily persuaded of the truth of them, and yet I dare not say all that are not so are irrevocably

[g] [A.D. 767. tom. iii. col. 2011.]

[h] [Compare Waterland, 'Critical history of the Athanasian Creed,' chap. xi.]

[i] [Other writers have contended that there is no attempt at explanation in the Athanasian Creed, but that the mystery of the Trinity is therein only asserted against heretics who explained it away.]

damned; because *citra hoc symbolum*, the faith of the apostles' creed is entire; and 'he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved,' that is, he that believeth such a belief as is sufficient disposition to be baptized, that faith with the sacrament is sufficient for heaven. Now the apostles' creed does one; why therefore do not both entitle us to the promise? Besides, if it were considered concerning Athanasius's creed, how many people understand it not, how contrary to natural reason it seems, how little the scripture[k] says of those curiosities of explication, and how tradition was not clear on his side for the article itself, much less for those forms and minutes, how himself is put to make an answer and excuse for the fathers[l] speaking in excuse[m] of the Arians, at least so seemingly that the Arians appealed to them for trial, and the offer was declined; and after all this, that the Nicene creed itself went not so far, neither in article, nor anathema, nor explication; it had not been amiss if the final judgment had been left to Jesus Christ, for He is appointed Judge of all the world, and He shall judge the people righteously, for He knows every truth, the degree of every necessity, and all excuses that do lessen or take away the nature or malice of a crime; all which I think Athanasius, though a very good man, did not know so well as to warrant such a sentence; and put case the heresy there condemned be damnable (as it is damnable enough) yet a man may maintain an opinion that is in itself damnable, and yet he, not knowing it so and being invincibly led into it, may go to heaven; his opinion shall burn, and himself be saved. But however, I find no opinions in scripture called damnable but what are impious *in materia practica*, or directly destructive of the faith, or the body of christianity; such of which St. Peter[n] speaks, "Bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that brought them; these are the false prophets who out of covetousness make merchandise of you through cozening words." Such as these are truly heresies, and such as these are certainly damnable. But because there are no degrees either of truth or falsehood, every true proposition being alike true; that an error is more or less damnable is not told us in scripture, but is determined by the man and his manners, by circumstances and accidents; and therefore the censure in the preface and end are arguments of his zeal and strength of his persuasion, but they are extrin-

[k] Vide Hosium de auctor. s. script., lib. iii. p. 53. [i. e. Confutatio, &c., lib. iii. scil. de auctor. s. script.—vid. per tot. libr. p. 513 sqq. fol. col. 1584.] et Gordon Huntlæum, tom. i. controv. 1. de Verbo Dei, c. 19. [potius 28 sqq. p. 105. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1620.]

[l] Vide Gretser. et Tanner. in colloq. Ratisbon. [passim, e. g. sess. xiv. f. 155 sqq. 4to. Monach. 1602.]—Eusebium fuisse Arrianum ait Perron, lib. iii. cap. 2. contre le roy Jacques. [?]—Idem ait Origenem negasse divinitatem Filii et Spir. S. lib. ii. cap. 7. de Eucharistia, contra Duplessis, [p. 219 init. fol. Par. 1622.]—Idem ['Replique' &c.] cap. 5. observ. iv. [p. 729.] ait Irenæum talia dixisse quæ qui hodie diceret pro Arriano reputaretur.—Vide etiam Fisher. in resp. ad 9 quæst. Jacobi Reg. [p. 106 fin. 4to. 1625.] et Epiphan. in hæres. lxix. [vol. i. p. 727 sqq.]

[m] ['favour,' A.]

[n] [2 Pet. ii. 1.]

sical and accidental to the articles, and might as well have been spared. And indeed to me it seems very hard to put uncharitableness into the creed, and so to make it become as an article of faith, though perhaps this very thing was no faith of Athanasius, who, if we may believe Aquinas[o], made this manifestation of faith *non per modum symboli sed per modum doctrinæ*, that is, if I understood him right, not with a purpose to impose it upon others, but with confidence to declare his own belief; and that it was prescribed to others as a creed was the act of the bishops of Rome; so he said: nay, possibly it was none of his; so said the patriarch of C.P. Meletius, about one hundred and thirty years since, in his epistle to John Douza[p], *Athanasio falso adscriptum symbolum, cum appendice illa Pontificum Rom. adulteratum, luce lucidius contestamur;* and it is more than probable that he said true, because this creed was written originally in Latin, which in all reason Athanasius did not, and it was translated into Greek, it being apparent that the Latin copy is but one, but the Greek is various, there being three editions or translations rather, expressed by Genebrard, lib. iii. *de Trinit.*[q] But in this particular, who list may better satisfy himself in a disputation *de symbolo Athanasii*, printed at Wertzburg, 1590, supposed to be written by Serrarius or Clencherus[r].

37. And yet I must observe that this symbol of Athanasius, and that other of Nice, offer not at any new articles; they only pretend to a further explication[s] of the articles apostolical, which is a certain confirmation that they did not believe more articles to be of belief necessary to salvation; if they intended these further explanations[t] to be as necessary as the dogmatical articles of the apostles' creed, I know not how to answer all that may be objected against that; but the advantage that I shall gather from their not proceeding to new matters, is laid out ready for me in the words of Athanasius, saying of this creed, "This is the catholic faith:" and if his authority be good, or his saying true, or he the author, then no man can say of any other article that it is a part of the catholic faith, or that the catholic faith can be enlarged beyond the contents of that symbol; and therefore it is a strange boldness in the church of Rome[u], first to add twelve new articles, and then to add the appendix of Athanasius to the end of them, "This is the catholic faith without which no man can be saved."

38. But so great an example of so excellent a man hath been

[o] D. Tho. 2. 2ᵉ. q. 1. artic. 1. [leg. 10.] ad 3um.

[p] [Ad calc. Georgii Dousæ de itinere suo C.Ptano epistolæ.—Meletius was patriarch of Alexandria, and exarch to the patriarch of C.P.; see Renaudot's 'Observatio,' &c. in his edition of Gennadius and others on the Eucharist, pp. 91, 98. 4to. Par. 1709.]

[q] [Præfat. in comm. vid. p. 371, not. s, supra.]

[r] [Inter Nicolai Serarii opuscula theologica, fol. Mogunt. 1611. tom. ii. p. 7 sqq.]

[s] [vid. not. i, supra.—It is however Bellarmine's word, De justif. i. 9 et pass.]

[t] ['explications,' A.]

[u] Bulla Pii quarti supra forma juramenti professionis fidei, in fin. Conc. Trid. [tom. x. col. 199.]

either mistaken or followed with too much greediness, all the world in factions, all damning one another, each party damned by all the rest; and there is no disagreeing in opinion from any man that is in love with his own opinion, but damnation presently to all that disagree. A ceremony and a rite hath caused several churches to excommunicate each other, as in the matter of the Saturday fast, and keeping Easter. But what the spirits of men are when they are exasperated in a question and difference of religion as they call it, though the thing itself may be most inconsiderable, is very evident in that request of pope Innocent III. desiring of the Greeks (but reasonably a man would think) that they would not so much hate the Roman manner of consecrating in unleavened bread as to wash, and scrape, and pare the altars after a Roman priest had consecrated. Nothing more furious than a mistaken zeal and the actions of a scrupulous and abused conscience: when men think every thing to be their faith and their religion, commonly they are so busy in trifles and such impertinencies in which the scene of their mistake lies, that they neglect the greater things of the law, charity, and compliances, and the gentleness of christian communion; for this is the great principle of mischief, and yet is not more pernicious than unreasonable.

39. For I demand, can any man say and justify that the apostles did deny communion to any man that believed the apostles' creed and lived a good life? and dare any man tax that proceeding of remissness and indifferency in religion? and since our blessed Saviour promised salvation to him that 'believeth' (and the apostles when they gave this word the greatest extent enlarged it not beyond the borders of the creed) how can any man warrant the condemning of any man to the flames of hell that is ready to die in attestation of this faith, so expounded and made explicit by the apostles, and lives accordingly? And to this purpose it was excellently said by a wise and a pious prelate, S. Hilary[x], *Non per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam quæstiones vocat, &c. In absoluto nobis et facili est æternitas; Jesum et suscitatum a mortuis per Deum credere, et ipsum esse Dominum confiteri, &c.* These are the articles which we must believe, which are the sufficient and adequate object of that faith which is required of us in order to salvation. And therefore it was that when the bishops of Istria deserted the communion of pope Pelagius *in causa trium capitulorum*[y], he gives them an account of his faith by recitation of the creed, and by attesting the four general councils; and is confident upon this that *de fidei firmitate nulla poterit esse quæstio, vel suspicio generari;* let the apostles' creed, especially so explicated, be but secured, and all faith is secured; and yet that explication too was less necessary than the articles themselves, for the explication was but accidental, but the articles even before the

[x] Lib. x. de Trin. ad finem. [col. 1080 E.]

[y] Concil. tom. iv. ed. Paris. [A.D. 1636.] p. 473.

explication were accounted a sufficient inlet to the kingdom of heaven.

40. And that there was security enough in the simple believing the first articles, is very certain amongst them and by their principles who allow of an implicit faith to serve most persons to the greatest purposes; for if the creed did contain in it the whole faith, and that other articles were in it implicitly (for such is the doctrine of the school, and particularly of Aquinas[z]) then he that explicitly believes all the creed does implicitly believe all the articles contained in it; and then it is better the implication should still continue, than that by any explication (which is simply unnecessary) the church should be troubled with questions and uncertain determinations, and factions enkindled, and animosities set on foot, and men's souls endangered who before were secured by the explicit belief of all that the apostles required as necessary; which belief also did secure them for[a] all the rest, because it implied the belief of whatsoever was virtually in the first articles, if such belief should by chance be necessary.

41. The sum of this discourse is this; if we take an estimate of the nature of faith from the dictates and promises evangelical and from the practice apostolical, the nature of faith and its integrity consists in such propositions which make the foundation of hope and charity, that which is sufficient to make us to do honour to Christ, and to obey Him, and to encourage us in both; and this is completed in the apostles' creed. And since contraries are of the same extent, heresy is to be judged by its proportion and analogy to faith, and that is heresy only which is against faith. Now because faith is not only a precept of doctrines but of manners and holy life, whatsoever is either opposite to an article of creed, or teaches ill life, that's heresy; but all those propositions which are extrinsical to these two considerations, be they true or be they false, make not heresy, nor the man a heretic; and therefore however he may be an erring person, yet he is to be used accordingly, pitied and instructed, not condemned or excommunicated; and this is the result of the first ground, the consideration of the nature of FAITH and HERESY.

§ 3. Of the difficulty and uncertainty of arguments from scripture, in questions not simply necessary, not literally determined.

1. God, who disposes of all things sweetly and according to the nature and capacity of things and persons, had made those only necessary which He had taken care should be sufficiently propounded to all persons of whom He required the explicit belief. And therefore all the articles of faith are clearly and plainly set down in scripture; and the gospel is not hid *nisi pereuntibus*, saith S. Paul[b]; *πάσης γὰρ ἀρετῆς παράκλησιν καὶ κακίας ἀπάσης ἀποτροπὴν ἐν ταύταις εὑρίσκομεν*, saith Damascene[c];

[z] 2. 2ᵉ. q. i. art. 10. cap. ['ad primum,' sq.]

[a] ['from,' B, C.]

[b] [2 Cor. iv. 3.]

[c] Orthod. fid., lib. iv. cap. 18. [al. 17. tom. i. p. 282 D.]

and that so manifestly that no man can be ignorant of the foundation of faith without his own apparent fault. And this is acknowledged by all wise and good men, and is evident, besides the reasonableness of the thing, in the testimonies of S. Austin[d], Hierome[e], Chrysostom[f], Fulgentius[g], Hugo de Sancto Victore[h], Theodoret[i], Lactantius[k], Theophilus Antiochenus[l], Aquinas[m], and the later school-men. And God hath done more, for many things which are only profitable are also set down so plainly that, as S. Austin says, *Nemo inde haurire non possit, si modo ad hauriendum devote ac pie accedat*, (*ubi supra, De util. cred. c.* 6.[n]) But of such things there is no question commenced in christendom; and if there were, it cannot but be a crime and human interest that are the authors of such disputes; and therefore these cannot be simple errors, but always heresies, because the principle of them is a personal sin.

2. But besides these things which are so plainly set down, some for doctrine, as S. Paul[o] says, that is, for articles and foundation of faith; some for instruction, some for reproof, some for comfort, that is, in matters practical and speculative, of several tempers and constitutions; there are innumerable places, containing in them great mysteries, but yet either so inwrapped with a cloud, or so darkened with umbrages or heightened with expressions, or so covered with allegories and garments of rhetoric, so profound in the matter, or so altered or made intricate in the manner, in the clothing, and in the dressing, that God may seem to have left them as trials of our industry, and arguments of our imperfections, and incentives to the longings after heaven and the clearest revelations of eternity, and as occasions and opportunities of our mutual charity and toleration to each other and humility in ourselves, rather than the repositories of faith, and furniture of creeds, and articles of belief.

3. For wherever the word of God is kept, whether in scripture alone or also in tradition, he that considers that the meaning of the one, and the truth or certainty of the other, are things of great question, will see a necessity in these things which are the subject matter of most of the questions of christendom that men should hope to be excused by an implicit faith in God almighty. For when there are in the explications of scripture so many commentaries, so many senses and interpretations, so many volumes in all ages, and all, like men's faces, exactly none like another, either this difference and incon-

[d] Super psalm. lxxxviii. [serm. ii. § 6.] et De util. cred. c. 6. [tom. iv. col. 948, et viii. 53.]

[e] Super Isa. c. xix. [?] et in psalm. lxxxvi. [tom. ii. part. 2. col. 350.]

[f] In 2 Thess. hom. 3. [§ 4. tom. xi. p. 528.]

[g] Serm. de confess. [i. e. 'De confessoribus,' &c. sic nonnull. edd.—al. 'De dispensatoribus Domini,' p. 546 sqq.]

[h] Miscell. ii. lib. i. tit. 46. [56? tom. iii. fol. 86 b.]

[i] In Gen. ap. Struch. [leg. 'Steuch.' scil. Augustin. Steuchum Eugubin. opp. tom. i.] p. 87.

[k] Lib. vi. cap. 21. [tom. i. p. 495 sq.]

[l] Ad Antioch., lib. ii. p. 918. [? 'Ad Autolyc., lib. ii. p. 91, &c.' scil. ad calc. opp. S. Just. Mart. fol. Par. 1636.]

[m] Part. i. [summ. theol.] q. 1. [art. 9.]

[n] [tom. viii. col. 53.]

[o] [vid. 2 Tim. iii. 16.]

venience is absolutely no fault at all, or if it be, it is excusable by a mind prepared to consent in that truth which God intended. And this I call an implicit faith in God; which is certainly of as great excellency as an implicit faith in any man or company of men. Because they who do require an implicit faith in the church for articles less necessary, and excuse the want of explicit faith by the implicit, do require an implicit faith in the church because they believe that God hath required of them to have a mind prepared to believe whatever the church says; which because it is a proposition of no absolute certainty, whosoever does in readiness of mind believe all that God spake, does also believe that sufficiently, if it be fitting to be believed, that is, if it be true, and if God hath said so; for he hath the same obedience of understanding in this as in the other. But because it is not so certain God hath tied him in all things to believe that which is called the church; and that it is certain we must believe God in all things, and yet neither know all that either God hath revealed or the church taught, it is better to take the certain than the uncertain, to believe God rather than men; especially since if God hath bound us to believe men, our absolute submission to God does involve that, and there is no inconvenience in the world this way but that we implicitly believe one article more, viz., the church's authority or infallibility; which may well be pardoned, because it secures our belief of all the rest; and we are sure if we believe all that God said explicitly or implicitly, we also believe the church implicitly in case we are bound to it; but we are not certain that if we believe any company of men whom we call the church, that we therefore obey God and believe what He hath said. But however, if this will not help us, there is no help for us but good fortune or absolute predestination; for by choice and industry no man can secure himself that in all the mysteries of religion taught in scripture he shall certainly understand and explicitly believe that sense that God intended. For to this purpose there are many considerations.

4. First, there are so many thousands of copies that were writ by persons of several interests and persuasions, such different understandings and tempers, such distinct abilities and weaknesses, that it is no wonder there is so great variety of readings both in the Old testament and in the New. In the Old testament the Jews pretend that the Christians have corrupted many places on purpose to make symphony between both the Testaments. On the other side the Christians have had so much reason to suspect the Jews, that when Aquila had translated the Bible in their schools and had been taught by them, they rejected the edition many of them, and some of them called it heresy to follow it. And Justin Martyr[p] justified it to Tryphon that the Jews had defalked many sayings from the books of the old prophets, and amongst the rest he instances in that of the psalm, *Dicite in nationibus quia Dominus regnavit a ligno.* The last

[p] [Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 73. p. 170 C.]

words they have cut off, and prevailed so far in it that to this day none of our Bibles have it; but if they ought not to have it, then Justin Martyr's Bible had more in it than it should have, for there it was; so that a fault there was either under or over. But however, there are infinite readings in the New testament (for in that I will instance) some whole verses in one that are not in another; and there was in some copies of S. Mark's gospel in the last chapter a whole verse, a chapter it was anciently called, that is not found in our Bibles, as S. Hierome[q] *ad Hedibiam*, q. 3, notes.—The words he repeats, lib. ii. *Contr. Polygamos*[r], *Et illi satis faciebant dicentes, Sæculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia est, quæ non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem, idcirco jam nunc revela justitiam tuam*, these words are thought by some to savour of Manichaism; and for aught I can find, were therefore rejected out of many Greek copies, and at last out of the Latin. Now suppose that a Manichee in disputation should urge this place, having found it in his Bible, if a catholic should answer him by saying it is apocryphal and not found in divers Greek copies, might not the Manichee ask how it came in if it was not the word of God, and if it was, how came it out? and at last take the same liberty of rejecting any other authority which shall be alleged against him, if he can find any copy that may favour him, however that favour be procured. And did not the Ebionites reject all the epistles of S. Paul upon pretence he was an enemy to the law of Moses? Indeed it was boldly and most unreasonably done; but if one title[s] or one chapter of S. Mark be called apocryphal for being suspected of Manichaism, it is a plea that will too much justify others in their taking and choosing what they list. But I will not urge it so far; but is not there as much reason for the fierce Lutherans to reject the epistle of S. James for favouring justification by works, or the epistle to the Hebrews upon pretence that the sixth and tenth chapters do favour Novatianism; especially since it was by some famous churches at first not accepted, even by the church of Rome herself?—The parable of the woman taken in adultery, which is now in John viii., Eusebius says was not in any gospel but the gospel *secundum Hebræos*[t]; and S. Hierome makes it doubtful; and so does S. Chrysostom and Euthymius, the first not vouchsafing to explicate it in his homilies upon S. John, the other affirming it not to be found in the exacter copies.—I shall not need to urge that there are some words so near in sound that the scribes might easily mistake: there is one famous one of Κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες[u], which yet some copies read καίρῳ δου-

[q] [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 172.]

[r] [leg. 'Contr. Pelagianos.' tom. iv. part. 2. col. 520.]

[s] ['tittle,' B. C.]

[t] [Eusebius only says that there was in the gospel according to the Hebrews 'an account of a woman accused of many sins before Christ.' Of the argument which has been raised upon this, and for reference to the other authorities here quoted, see Wetstein on John viii.]

[u] [Rom. xii. 11.]

λεύοντες, the sense is very unlike[v] though the words be near, and there needs some little luxation to strain this latter reading to a good sense. That famous precept of S. Paul[w], that 'the women must pray with a covering on their head διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, because of the angels,' hath brought into the church an opinion that angels are present in churches and are spectators of our devotion and deportment[x]. Such an opinion, if it should meet with peevish opposites on the one side and confident hyperaspists on the other, might possibly make a sect; and here were a clear ground for the affirmative, and yet who knows but that it might have been a mistake of the transcribers[y]; for if it were read as Gothofrid[z] and some others would have it, διὰ τοὺς ἀγέλους, or rather διὰ τὰς ἀγέλας or τοὺς ἀγελαίους, that the sense be, 'women in public assemblies must wear a veil, by reason of the companies of the young men there present,' it would be no ill exchange for the little change of some letters in a word[a], to make so probable, so clear a sense of the place. But the instances in this kind are too many, as appears in the variety of readings in several copies proceeding from the negligence or ignorance of the transcribers, or the malicious endeavour of heretics[b], or the inserting marginal notes into the text, or the nearness of several words. Indeed there is so much evidence of this particular, that it hath encouraged the servants of the Vulgar translation (for so some are now-a-days) to prefer that translation before the original; for although they have attempted that proposition with very ill success, yet that they could think it possible to be proved is an argument there is much variety and alterations in divers texts; for if there were not, it were impudence to pretend a translation, and that none of the best, should be better than the original. But so it is that this variety of reading is not of slight consideration; for although it be demonstrably true that all things necessary to faith and good manners are preserved from alteration and corruption, because they are of things necessary, and they could not be necessary unless they were delivered to us, God in His goodness and His justice having obliged Himself to preserve that which He hath bound us to observe and keep; yet in other things which God hath not obliged Himself so punctually to preserve, in these things since variety of reading is crept in, every reading takes away a degree of certainty from any proposition derivative from those places so read: and if some copies (especially if they be public and notable) omit a verse or a title, every argument from such a title or verse loses much of its strength and reputation. And we find it in a great instance: for when in probation of the

[v] ['unlikely,' B, C.]

[w] [1 Cor. xi. 10.]

[x] [But see also p. 331, not. y, supra.]

[y] [add, 'to double the γ,' A.]

[z] [In tract. 'De imperio maris,' cap. iii. p. 14. 4to. 1637. The various readings however are all conjectural.—The strangest attempts have been made to escape from the sacred doctrine of the text; 'ὄχλους s. ἄνδρας s. ἀγέλους s. ἀπαγέλους s. ἀγελαίους s. διαβόλους. conject.'—Griesb.]

[a] ['for the loss of a letter,' A.]

[b] Græci corruperunt Novum Testamentum, ut testantur Tertull., lib. v. adv. Marcion. [cap. iii. p. 463.] Euseb., lib. v. hist. c. ult. [p. 253.] Iren., lib. i. c. 29. adv. hæres. [al. 27. p. 106.] Basil., lib. ii. contr. Eunom. [tom. i. p. 244 C.]

way of argument; yet the fathers[1] were free enough to use such mediums to prove mysteries of great concernment; but yet again when they speak either against an adversary or with consideration, they deny that such mystical senses can sufficiently confirm a question of faith. But I shall instance in the great question of rebaptization of heretics, which many saints and martyrs and confessors, and divers councils, and almost all Asia and Africa, did once believe and practise. Their grounds for the invalidity of the baptism by a heretic were such mystical words as these, *Oleum peccatoris non impinguet caput meum,* Ps. cxl.; and *Qui baptizatur a mortuo, quid proficit lavatio ejus?* Ecclus. xxxiv.; and *Ab aqua aliena abstinete,* Prov. v.; and *Deus peccatores non exaudit,* John ix.; and "he that is not with Me is against Me," Luke xi. I am not sure the other part had arguments so good. For the great one of *una fides, unum baptisma,* did not conclude it to their understandings who were of the other opinion, and men famous in their generations; for it was no argument that they who had been baptized by John's baptism should not be baptized in the name of Jesus, because *unus Deus, unum baptisma*; and as it is still one faith which a man confesseth several times, and one sacrament of the eucharist though a man often communicates, so it might be one baptism though often ministered. And the unity of baptism might not be derived from the unity of the ministration, but from the unity of the religion into which they are baptized; though baptized a thousand times, yet because it was still in the name of the holy Trinity, still into the death of Christ, it might be *unum baptisma.* Whether S. Cyprian, Firmilian, and their colleagues, had this discourse or no (I know not) I am sure they might have had much better to have evacuated the force of that argument, although I believe they had the wrong cause in hand. But this is it that I say, that when a question is so undetermined in scripture that the arguments rely only upon such mystical places whence the best fancies can draw the greatest variety, and such which perhaps were never intended by the Holy Ghost, it were good the rivers did not swell higher than the fountain, and the confidence higher than the argument and evidence; for in this case there could not any thing be so certainly proved as that the disagreeing party should deserve to be condemned by a sentence of excommunication for disbelieving it; and yet they were; which I wonder at so much the more, because they who (as it was since judged) had the right cause, had not any sufficient argument from scripture, not so much as such mystical arguments, but did fly to the tradition of the church, in which also I shall afterwards shew they had nothing that was absolutely certain.

6. Thirdly, I consider that there are divers places of scripture containing in them mysteries and questions of great concernment, and yet the fabric and constitution is such that there is no certain mark

[1] Hieron. in Matt. xiii. [per tot.—tom. iv. part. i. col. 55 sqq.]

to determine whether the sense of them should be literal or figurative; I speak not here concerning extrinsical means of determination, as traditive interpretations, councils, fathers, popes, and the like; I shall consider them afterward in their several places; but here the subject matter being concerning scripture in its own capacity, I say there is nothing in the nature of the thing to determine the sense and meaning, but it must be gotten out as it can; and that therefore it is unreasonable that what of itself is ambiguous, should be understood in its own prime sense and intention, under the pain of either a sin or an anathema. I instance in that famous place from whence hath sprung that question of transubstantiation, *Hoc est corpus meum;* the words are plain and clear, apt to be understood in the literal sense; and yet this sense is so hard as it does violence to reason, and therefore it is the question whether or no it be not a figurative speech. But here what shall we have to determine it? What mean soever we take and to what sense soever you will expound it, you shall be put to give an account why you expound other places of scripture in the same case to quite contrary senses. For if you expound it literally, then besides that it seems to intrench upon the words of our blessed Saviour[i], 'The words that I speak, they are spirit and they are life,' that is, to be spiritually understood (and it is a miserable thing to see what wretched shifts are used to reconcile the literal sense to these words, and yet to distinguish it from the Capernaitical fancy) but besides this, why are not those other sayings of Christ expounded literally, 'I am a vine,' 'I am the door,' 'I am a rock?' why do we fly to a figure in those parallel words, 'This is the covenant which I make between Me and you,' and yet that covenant was but the sign of the covenant? and why do we fly to a figure in a precept, as well as in mystery and a proposition, 'If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off,' and yet we have figures enough to save a limb. If it be said, because reason tells us these are not to be expounded according to the letter; this will be no plea for them who retain the literal exposition of the other instance against all reason, against all philosophy, against all sense, and against two or three sciences. But if you expound these words figuratively, besides that you are to contest against a world of prejudices, you give yourself the liberty which if others will use when either they have a reason or a necessity so to do, they may perhaps turn all into allegory, and so may evacuate any precept and elude any argument. Well, so it is that very wise men have expounded things allegorically[j] when they should have expounded them literally. So did the famous Origen, who, as S. Hierome[k] reports of him, turned paradise so into an allegory, that he took away quite the truth of the

[i] [John vi. 63.]

[j] Sic Hieron. [præfat. in Abd. tom. iii. col. 1453.] In adolescentia, provocatus ardore et studio scripturarum, allegorice interpretatus sum Abdiam prophetam, cujus historiam nesciebam.—De sensu allegorico s. script. dixit Basilius, *ὃς κεκομψευμένον μὲν τὸν λόγον ἀποδεχόμεθα, ἀληθῆ δὲ εἶναι οὐ πάνυ δόσομεν.*

[k] [ep. xxxviii. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 310.]

story; and not only Adam was turned out of the garden, but the garden itself out of paradise. Others expound things literally when they should understand them in allegory: so did the ancient Papias understand (Apocal. xx.) Christ's millenary reign upon earth, and so depressed the hopes of christianity and their desires to the longing and expectation of temporal pleasures and satisfactions: and he was followed[l] by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and indeed the whole church generally, till S. Austin[m] and S. Hierome's[n] time, who first of any whose works are extant did reprove the error. If such great spirits be deceived in finding out what kind of senses be to be given to scriptures, it may well be endured that we who sit at their feet, may also tread in the steps of them whose feet could not always tread aright.

7. Fourthly, I consider that there are some places of scripture that have the self-same expressions, the same preceptive words, the same reason and account in all appearance, and yet either must be expounded to quite different senses, or else we must renounce the communion and the charities of a great part of christendom; and yet there is absolutely nothing in the thing, or in its circumstances, or in its adjuncts, that can determine it to different purposes. I instance in those great exclusive negatives for the necessity of both sacraments, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua*, &c. *Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis*, &c., a *non introibit in regnum cœlorum*, for both these. Now then the first is urged for the absolute indispensable necessity of baptism even in infants, insomuch that infants go to part of hell if, inculpably both on their own and their parents' part, they miss of baptism; for that is the doctrine of the church of Rome, which they learned from S. Austin; and others also do from hence baptize infants, though with a less opinion of its absolute necessity. And yet the same manner of precept, in the same form of words, in the same manner of threatening, by an exclusive negative, shall not enjoin us to communicate infants, though damnation, at least in form of words, be exactly and *per omnia* alike appendent to the neglect of holy baptism and the venerable eucharist. If *nisi quis renatus* shall conclude against the anabaptist for necessity of baptizing infants (as sure enough we say it does) why shall not an equal *nisi comederitis* bring infants to the holy communion? The primitive church for some two whole ages did follow their own principles, wherever they led them; and seeing that upon the same ground equal results must follow, they did communicate infants as soon as they had baptized them. And why the church of Rome should not do so too, being she expounds *nisi comederitis* of oral manducation, I cannot yet learn a reason. And for others that expound it of a spiritual manducation, why they shall not allow the disagreeing part the same liberty of expounding *nisi quis renatus* too, I by no means can understand.

[l] [see p. 429 note f, infra.]

[m] De civ. Dei, lib. xx. cap. 7. [tom. vii. col. 580.]

[n] Præfat., lib. xix. in Isai. [leg. lib. xviii. tom. iii. col. 477.] et in cap. xxxvi. Ezek. [tom. iii. col. 954.]

And in these cases no external determiner can be pretended in answer; for whatsoever is extrinsical to the words, as councils, traditions, church authority, and fathers, either have said nothing at all, or have concluded by their practice contrary to the present opinion, as is plain in[o] their communicating infants by virtue of *nisi comederitis*.

8. Fifthly, I shall not need to urge the mysteriousness of some points in scripture which *ex natura rei* are hard to be understood though very plainly represented. For there are some *secreta theologiæ*, which are only to be understood by persons very holy and spiritual; which are rather to be felt than discoursed of; and therefore if peradventure they be offered to public consideration, they will therefore be opposed because they run the same fortune with many other questions, that is, not to be understood, and so much the rather because their understanding, that is, the feeling such secrets of the kingdom, are not the results of logic and philosophy, nor yet of public revelation, but of the public spirit privately working; and in no man is a duty, but in all that have it is a reward; and is not necessary for all, but given to some; producing its operations not regularly, but upon occasions, personal necessities, and new emergencies. Of this nature are the spirit of obsignation, belief of particular salvation, special influences and comforts coming from a sense of the spirit of adoption, actual fervours and great complacencies in devotion, spiritual joys, which are little drawings aside of the curtains of peace and eternity, and antepasts of immortality. But the not understanding the perfect constitution and temper of these mysteries (and it is hard for any man so to understand as to make others do so too that feel them not) is cause that in many questions of secret theology, by being very apt and easy to be mistaken, there is a necessity in forbearing one another; and this consideration would have been of good use in the question between Soto and Catharinus[p], both for the preservation of their charity and explication of the mystery.

9. Sixthly; But here it will not be unseasonable to consider, that all systems and principles of science are expressed so that, either by reason of the universality of the terms and subject matter, or the infinite variety of human understandings, and these peradventure swayed by interest or determined by things accidental and extrinsical, they seem to divers men, nay, to the same men upon divers occasions, to speak things extremely disparate, and sometimes contrary, but very often of great variety. And this very thing happens also in scripture, that if it were not *in re sacra et seria*, it were excellent sport to observe how the same place of scripture serves several turns upon occasion, and they at that time believe the words sound nothing else, whereas in the liberty of their judgment and abstracting from that occasion their commentaries understand them wholly to a differing sense. It is a wonder of what excellent use to the church

[o] ['by' C.] [p] [Bellarm. de scriptt. eccles., tom. iii. col. 198.]

of Rome is *Tibi dabo claves;* it was spoken to Peter and none else sometimes, and therefore it concerns him and his successors only, the rest are to derive from him. And yet if you question them for their sacrament of penance, and priestly absolution, then *Tibi dabo claves* comes in, and that was spoken to S. Peter, and in him to the whole college of the apostles, and in them to the whole hierarchy. If you question why the pope pretends to free souls from purgatory, *Tibi dabo claves* is his warrant; but if you tell him the keys are only for binding and loosing on earth directly and in heaven consequently, and that purgatory is a part of hell, or rather neither earth nor heaven nor hell, and so the keys seem to have nothing to do with it, then his commission is to be enlarged by a suppletory of reason and consequences, and his keys shall unlock this difficulty, for it is *clavis scientiæ* as well as *auctoritatis*. And these keys shall enable him to expound scriptures infallibly, to determine questions, to preside in councils, to dictate to all the world magisterially, to rule the church, to dispense with oaths, to abrogate laws: and if his key of knowledge will not, the key of authority shall, and *Tibi dabo claves* shall answer for all.—We have an instance in the single fancy of one man, what rare variety of matter is afforded from those plain words of *Oravi pro te Petre*, Luke xxii.; for that place, says Bellarmine[q], is otherwise to be understood of Peter, otherwise of the popes, and otherwise of the church of Rome. And *pro te* signifies that Christ prayed that Peter might neither err personally nor judicially; and that Peter's successors, if they did err personally, might not err judicially; and that the Roman church might not err personally. All this variety of sense is pretended by the fancy of one man to be in a few words which are as plain and simple as are any words in scripture; and what then in those thousands that are intricate?—So is done with *Pasce oves*, which a man would think were a commission as innocent and guiltless of designs as the sheep in the folds are. But if it be asked why the bishop of Rome calls himself universal bishop, *Pasce oves* is his warrant; why he pretends to a power of deposing princes, *Pasce oves*, said Christ to Peter the second time; if it be demanded why also he pretends to a power of authorizing his subjects to kill him, *Pasce agnos*, said Christ the third time: and *pasce* is *doce*, and *pasce* is *impera*, and *pasce* is *occide*. Now if others should take the same (unreasonableness I will not say, but the same) liberty in expounding scripture; or if it be not license taken, but that the scripture itself is so full and redundant in senses quite contrary; what man soever or what company of men soever shall use this principle will certainly find such rare productions from several places, that either the unreasonableness of the thing will discover the error of the proceeding, or else there will be a necessity of permitting a great liberty of judgment, where is so infinite variety without limit or mark

[q] Bellarm., lib. iv. de pontif. cap. 3. § 'Respondeo primo.' [tom. i. col. 966.]

of necessary determination. If the first, then because an error is so obvious and ready to ourselves, it will be great imprudence or tyranny to be hasty in judging others; but if the latter, it is it that I contend for; for it is most unreasonable, when either the thing itself ministers variety, or that we take license to ourselves in variety of interpretations, or proclaim to all the world our great weakness by our actually being deceived, that we should either prescribe to others magisterially when we are in error, or limit their understandings when the thing itself affords liberty and variety.

§ 4. Of the difficulty of expounding scripture.

1. THESE considerations are taken from the nature of scripture itself; but then if we consider that we have no certain ways of determining places of difficulty and question infallibly and certainly, but that we must hope to be saved in the belief of things plain, necessary, and fundamental, and our pious endeavour to find out God's meaning in such places which He hath left under a cloud for other great ends reserved to His own knowledge, we shall see a very great necessity in allowing a liberty in prophesying, without prescribing authoritatively to other men's consciences, and becoming lords and masters of their faith. Now the means of expounding scripture are either external or internal: for the external, as church authority, tradition, fathers, councils, and decrees of bishops, they are of a distinct consideration, and follow after in their order: but here we will first consider the invalidity and uncertainty of all those means of expounding scripture which are more proper and internal to the nature of the thing. The great masters of commentaries, some whereof have undertaken to know all mysteries, have propounded many ways to expound scripture, which indeed are excellent helps, but not infallible assistances, both because themselves are but moral instruments, which force not truth *ex abscondito*, as also because they are not infallibly used and applied.

First, sometimes the sense is drawn forth by the context and connexion of parts. It is well when it can be so; but when there is two or three antecedents and subjects spoken of, what man or what rule shall ascertain me that I make my reference true by drawing the relation to such an antecedent, to which I have a mind to apply it, another hath not? For in a contexture where one part does not always depend upon another, where things of differing natures intervene and interrupt the first intentions, there it is not always very probable to expound scripture and take its meaning by its proportion to the neighbouring words. But who desires satisfaction in this, may read the observation verified in S. Gregory's morals upon Job, lib. v. c. 29[r]; and the instances he there brings are excellent proof that this way of interpretation does not warrant any man to impose his expositions upon the belief and understanding of other men too confidently and magisterially.

[r] [al. cap. xlii. § 74. tom. i. col. 173.]

2. Secondly, another great pretence of[a] medium is the conference of places, which Illyricus calls *ingens remedium et felicissimam expositionem sanctæ scripturæ;* and indeed so it is if well and temperately used; but then we are beholding to them that do so, for there is no rule that can constrain them to it; for comparing of places is of so indefinite capacity, that if there be ambiguity of words, variety of sense, alteration of circumstances, or difference of style amongst divine writers, then there is nothing that may be more abused by wilful people, or may more easily deceive the unwary, or that may more amuse the most intelligent observer. The anabaptists take advantage enough in this proceeding (and indeed so may any one that list) and when we pretend against them the necessity of baptizing all, by authority of *nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu,* they have a parallel for it, and tell us that Christ will "baptize us with the Holy Ghost and with fire," and that one place expounds the other; and because by fire is not meant an element or any thing that is natural, but an allegory and figurative expression of the same thing; so also by water may be meant the figure signifying the effect or manner of operation of the Holy Spirit: fire in one place, and water in the other, do but represent to us that Christ's baptism is nothing else but the cleansing and purifying us by the Holy Ghost. But that which I here note as of greatest concernment, and which in all reason ought to be an utter overthrow to this topic, is an universal abuse of it among those that use it most; and when two places seem to have the same expression, or if a word have a double signification, because in this place it may have such a sense, therefore it must; because in one of the places the sense is to their purpose, they conclude that therefore it must be so in the other too. An instance I give in the great question between the Socinians and the catholics. If any place be urged in which our blessed Saviour is called God, they shew you two or three where the word 'God' is taken in a depressed sense for a *quasi Deus,* as when God said to Moses, *Constitui te deum Pharaonis;* and hence they argue, because I can shew the word is used for a *deus factus,* therefore no argument is sufficient to prove Christ to be *Deus verus* from the appellative of *Deus.* And might not another argue to the exact contrary, and as well urge that Moses is *Deus verus,* because in some places the word *Deus* is used *pro Deo æterno?* both ways the argument concludes impiously and unreasonably. It is a fallacy *a posse ad esse affirmative;* because breaking of bread is sometimes used for a eucharistical manducation in scripture, therefore I shall not from any testimony of scripture affirming the first Christians to have broken bread together conclude that they lived hospitably and in common society: because it may possibly be eluded, therefore it does not signify any thing. And this is the great way of answering all the arguments that can be brought against any thing that any man hath a mind to defend, and any man that reads any controversies of any side shall find as many instances

[a] ['or' C.]

of this vanity almost as he finds arguments from scripture; this fault was of old noted by S. Austin[t], for then they had got the trick, and he is angry at it; *neque enim putare debemus*[u] *esse præscriptum ut quod in aliquo loco res aliqua per similitudinem significaverit, hoc etiam*[u] *semper significare credamus.*

3. Thirdly, oftentimes scriptures are pretended to be expounded by a proportion and analogy of reason. And this is as the other; if it be well, it's well: but unless there were some *intellectus universalis* furnished with infallible propositions, by referring to which every man might argue infallibly, this logic may deceive as well as any of the rest. For it is with reason as with men's tastes; although there are some general principles which are reasonable to all men, yet every man is not able to draw out all its consequences, nor to understand them when they are drawn forth, nor to believe when he does understand them. There is a precept of S. Paul directed to the Thessalonians before they were gathered into a body of a church, 2 Thess. iii. 6, to 'withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly.' But if this precept were now observed, I would fain know whether we should not fall into that inconvenience which S. Paul sought to avoid in giving the same commandment to the church of Corinth, 1 Cor. v. 9, "I wrote to you that ye should not company with fornicators;" and "yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, for then ye must go out of the world," and therefore he restrains it to a quitting the society of Christians living ill lives. But now that all the world hath been Christians, if we should sin in keeping company with vicious Christians, must we not also go out of this world? Is not the precept made null, because the reason is altered, and things are come about, and that the οἱ πολλοὶ are the 'brethren,' ἀδελφοὶ ὀνομαζόμενοι, 'called brethren,' as S. Paul's phrase is? And yet either this never was considered, or not yet believed; for it is generally taken to be obligatory, though I think seldom practised. But when we come to expound scriptures to a certain sense by arguments drawn from prudential motives, then we are in a vast plain without any sufficient guide, and we shall have so many senses as there are human prudences.—But that which goes further than this, is a parity of reason from a plain place of scripture to an obscure, from that which is plainly set down in a text to another that is more remote from it. And thus is that place in S. Matthew forced, 'If thy brother refuse to be amended,' *dic ecclesiæ*. Hence some of the Roman doctors argue, if Christ commands to 'tell the church' in case of adultery or private injury, then much more in case of heresy. Well, suppose this to be a good interpretation, why must I stay here? why may I not also add by a parity of reason, if the church must be told of heresy, much more of treason: and why may not I reduce all sins to the cognizance of a church-tribunal, as some men[v] do indirectly, and

[t] De doctrin. christian. [lib. iii. cap. 25. tom. iii. part. i. col. 55.]

[u] [leg. 'non putemus,' 'eam.']

[v] [vid. p. 151 supra, not. y.]

Snecanus[w] does heartily and plainly? If a man's principles be good and his deductions certain, he need not care whither they carry him; but when an authority is intrusted to a person, and the extent of his power expressed in his commission, it will not be safety to meddle beyond his commission upon confidence of a parity of reason.—To instance once more: when Christ in *Pasce oves* and *Tu es Petrus*, gave power to the pope to govern the church (for to that sense the church of Rome expounds those authorities) by a certain consequence of reason, say they, He gave all things necessary for exercise of this jurisdiction; and therefore in *Pasce oves* He gave him an indirect power over temporals, for that is necessary that he may do his duty: well, having gone thus far, we will go further upon the parity of reason; therefore He hath given the pope the gift of tongues, and He hath given him power to give it; for how else shall Xavier convert the Indians? He hath given him power also to command the seas and the winds that they should obey him, for this also is very necessary in some cases. And so *pasce oves* is *accipe donum linguarum*, and *impera ventis, et dispone regum diademata et laicorum prædia*, and *influentias cœli* too, and whatsoever the parity of reason will judge equally necessary in order to *pasce oves*.—When a man does speak reason, it is but reason he should be heard; but though he may have the good fortune or the great abilities to do it, yet he hath not a certainty, no regular infallible assistance, no inspiration of arguments and deductions; and if he had, yet because it must be reason that must judge of reason, unless other men's understandings were of the same air, the same constitution and ability, they cannot be prescribed unto by another man's reason; especially because such reasonings as usually are in explication of particular places of scripture, depend upon minute circumstances and particularities, in which it is so easy to be deceived, and so hard to speak reason regularly and always, that it is the greater wonder if we be not deceived.

4. Fourthly, others pretend to expound scripture by the analogy of faith; and that is the most sure and infallible way, as it is thought, but upon stricter survey it is but a chimera, a thing *in nubibus*, which varies like the right hand and left hand of a pillar, and at the best is but like the coast of a country to a traveller out of his way; it may bring him to his journey's end though twenty miles about; it may keep him from running into the sea, and from mistaking a river for dry land, but whether this little path or the other be the right way it tells not. So is the analogy of faith, that is, if I understand it right, the rule of faith, that is, the creed. Now were it not a fine device to go to expound all the scripture by the creed, there being in it so many thousand places which have no more relation to any article in the creed than they have to *Tityre tu patulæ?* Indeed if a man resolves to keep the analogy of faith, that is, to expound scripture so as not to do any violence to any fundamental article, he shall

[w] [vid. p. 151 supra, not. z.]

be sure however he errs yet not to destroy faith, he shall not perish in his exposition; and that was the precept given by S. Paul, that all prophesyings should be estimated κατ' ἀναλογίαν πίστεως, Rom. vi. 12; and to this very purpose S. Austin[x] in his exposition of Genesis, by way of preface sets down the articles of faith, with this design and protestation of it, that if he says nothing against those articles, though he miss the particular sense of the place, there is no danger or sin in his exposition; but how that analogy of faith should have any other influence in expounding such places in which those articles of faith are neither expressed nor involved, I understand not. But then if you extend the analogy of faith further than that which is proper to the rule or symbol of faith, then every man expounds scripture according to the analogy of faith; but what? his own faith: which faith, if it be questioned, I am no more bound to expound according to the analogy of another man's faith than he to expound according to the analogy of mine. And this is it that is complained of on all sides that overvalue their own opinions. Scripture seems so clearly to speak what they believe that they wonder all the world does not see it as clear as they do: but they satisfy themselves with saying that it is because they come with prejudice, whereas if they had the true belief, that is, theirs, they would easily see what they see. And this is very true: for if they did believe as others believe, they would expound scriptures to their sense; but if this be expounding according to the analogy of faith, it signifies no more than this, 'Be you of my mind, and then my arguments will seem concluding, and my authorities and allegations pressing and pertinent:' and this will serve on all sides, and therefore will do but little service to the determination of questions, or prescribing to other men's consciences on any side.

5. Lastly, consulting the originals is thought a great matter to interpretation of scriptures. But this is to small purpose; for indeed it will expound the Hebrew and the Greek, and rectify translations; but I know no man that says that the scriptures in Hebrew and Greek are easy and certain to be understood, and that they are hard in Latin and English: the difficulty is in the thing however it be expressed, the least is in the language. If the original languages were our mother tongue, scripture is not much the easier to us; and a natural Greek or a Jew can with no more reason or authority obtrude his interpretations upon other men's consciences, than a man of another nation. Add to this that the inspection of the original is no more certain way of interpretation of scripture now than it was to the fathers and primitive ages of the church; and yet he that observes what infinite variety of translations of the Bible were in the first ages of the church (as S. Hierome observes) and never a one like another, will think that we shall differ as much in our interpretations as they did, and that the medium is as uncertain to us as it was to them: and so it

[x] [De Gen. ad lit. cap. i. tom. iii. part. 1. col. 93.]

is; witness the great number of late translations, and the infinite number of commentaries, which are too pregnant an argument that we neither agree in the understanding of the words nor of the sense.

6. The truth is, all these ways of interpreting of scripture which of themselves are good helps, are made either by design or by our infirmities ways of intricating and involving scriptures in greater difficulty; because men do not learn their doctrines from scripture, but come to the understanding of scripture with preconceptions and ideas of doctrines of their own; and then no wonder that scriptures look like pictures, wherein every man in the room believes they look on him only, and that wheresoever he stands or how often soever he changes his station. So that now what was intended for a remedy becomes the promoter of our disease, and our meat becomes the matter of sickness: and the mischief is, the wit of man cannot find a remedy for it; for there is no rule, no limit, no certain principle, by which all men may be guided to a certain and so infallible an interpretation that he can with any equity prescribe to others to believe his interpretations in places of controversy or ambiguity. A man would think that the memorable prophecy of Jacob that "the sceptre should not depart from Judah till Shiloh come," should have been so clear a determination of the time of the Messias that a Jew should never have doubted it to have been verified in Jesus of Nazareth; and yet for this so clear vaticination they have no less than twenty-six answers. S. Paul and S. James seem to speak a little diversely concerning justification by faith and works, and yet to my understanding it is very easy to reconcile them: but all men are not of my mind: for Osiander in his confutation of the book which Melancthon wrote against him, observes that there are twenty[x] several opinions concerning justification, all drawn from the scriptures, by the men only of the Augustan confession. There are sixteen several opinions concerning original sin; and as many definitions of the sacraments as there are sects of men that disagree about them.

7. And now what help is there for us in the midst of these uncertainties? If we follow any one translation or any one man's commentary, what rule shall we have to choose the right by? or is there any one man that hath translated perfectly or expounded infallibly? No translation challenges such a prerogative to be[y] authentic but the Vulgar Latin; and yet see with what good success: for when it was declared authentic by the council of Trent, Sixtus put forth a copy much mended of what it was, and tied all men to follow that: but that did not satisfy; for pope Clement reviews[z] and corrects it in many places, and still the decree remains in a changed subject. And secondly, that translation will be very unapt to satisfy, in which one

[x] ['Quatuordecim.' vit. Andr. Osiand. per Ulenberg. cap. iii. § 2. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1622.]

[y] ['as to be' A.]

[z] ['revives' B. C.]

of their own men, Isidore Clarius[y] a monk of Brescia found and mended eight thousand faults, besides innumerable others which he says he pretermitted. And then thirdly, to shew how little themselves were satisfied with it, divers learned men among them did new translate the Bible, and thought they did God and the church good service in it. So that if you take this for your precedent, you are sure to be mistaken infinitely; if you take any other, the authors themselves do not promise you any security; if you resolve to follow any one as far only as you see cause, then you only do wrong or right by chance, for you have certainty just proportionable to your own skill, to your own infallibility. If you resolve to follow any one whithersoever he leads, we shall oftentimes come thither where we shall see ourselves become ridiculous; as it happened in the case of Spiridion[z] bishop of Cyprus, who so resolved to follow his old book, that when an eloquent bishop who was desired to preach read his text, *Tu autem tolle cubile tuum et ambula,* Spiridion was very angry with him, because in his book it was *tolle lectum tuum,* and thought it arrogance in the preacher to speak better Latin than his translator had done[a]. And if it be thus in translations, it is far worse in expositions, *Quia scilicet scripturam sacram pro ipsa sui altitudine non uno eodemque sensu omnes accipiunt, ut pene quot homines tot illic sententiæ erui posse videantur,* said Vincentius Lirinensis[b]. In which every man knows what innumerable ways there are of being mistaken, God having in things not simply necessary left such a difficulty upon those parts of scripture which are the subject matters of controversy, *ad edomandam labore superbiam, et intellectum a fastidio revocandum,* as S. Austin[c] gives a reason, that all that err honestly are therefore to be pitied and tolerated, because it is or may be the condition of every man at one time or other.

8. The sum is this: since holy scripture is the repository of divine truths and the great rule of faith, to which all sects of Christians do appeal for probation of their several opinions; and since all agree in the articles of the creed as things clearly and plainly set down, and as containing all that which is of simple and prime necessity; and since on the other side, there are in scripture many other mysteries and matters of question upon which there is a veil; since there are so many copies with infinite varieties of reading; since a various interpunction, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent, may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literal senses, many have spiritual, mystical, and allegorical meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends upon such circumstances that

[y] [Editor of the Vulgate, Venet. 1564.]

[z] [Sozom. hist. eccles. i. 11.]

[a] [The anecdote was as follows;—The preacher, quoting Christ's words to the paralytic, altered κράββατον to σκίμποδα· at this Spiridion was indignant; 'Art thou better,' said he, 'than He who said κράββατον, that thou art ashamed to use His word?']

[b] In Commonit. [cap. ii. p. 103.]

[c] Lib. ii. de doctr. christian. c. 6. [tom. iii. part. i. col. 21.]

it is almost impossible to know its proper interpretation now that the knowledge of such circumstances and particular stories is irrevocably lost; since there are some mysteries which at the best advantage of expression are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication by reason of our imperfections must needs be dark, sometimes weak, sometimes unintelligible; and lastly, since those ordinary means of expounding scripture, as searching the originals, conference of places, parity of reason, and analogy of faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible; he that is the wisest, and by consequence the likeliest to expound truest in all probability of reason, will be very far from confidence; because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of improbability and incertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries and amidst so many difficulties. And therefore a wise man that considers this would not willingly be prescribed to by others, and therefore if he also be a just man he will not impose upon others; for it is best every man should be left in that liberty from which no man can justly take him unless he could secure him from error: so that here also there is a necessity to conserve the liberty of prophesying and interpreting scripture: a necessity derived from the consideration of the difficulty of scripture in questions controverted, and the uncertainty of any internal medium of interpretation.

§ 5. Of the insufficiency and uncertainty of tradition to expound scripture, or determine questions.

1. In the next place we must consider those extrinsical means of interpreting scripture and determining questions, which they most of all confide in that restrain prophesying with the greatest tyranny. The first and principal is tradition, which is pretended not only to expound scripture (*Necesse enim est propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus normam dirigatur*[d]) but also to propound articles upon a distinct stock, such articles, whereof there is no mention and proposition in scripture. And in this topic, not only the distinct articles are clear and plain, like as fundamentals of faith expressed in scripture, but also it pretends to expound scripture and to determine questions with so much clarity and certainty, as there shall neither be error nor doubt remaining, and therefore no disagreeing is here to be endured. And indeed it is most true, if tradition can perform these pretensions, and teach us plainly, and assure us infallibly of all truths which they require us to believe, we can in this case have no reason to disbelieve them, and therefore are certainly heretics if we do, because without a crime, without some human interest or collateral design, we cannot disbelieve traditive doctrine or traditive interpretation, if it be infallibly proved to us that tradition is an infallible guide.

2. But here I first consider that tradition is no repository of articles

[d] Vincent. Lirinens. in Commonitor. [cap. ii. p. 103.]

of faith, and therefore the not following it is no argument of heresy; for besides that I have shewed scripture in its plain expresses to be an abundant rule of faith and manners, tradition is a topic as fallible as any other, so fallible that it cannot be sufficient evidence to any man in a matter of faith or question of heresy.

3. For first, I find that the fathers were infinitely deceived in their account and enumeration of traditions: sometimes they did call some traditions, such not which they knew to be so, but by arguments and presumptions they concluded them so. Such as was that of S. Austin[e], *Ea quæ universalis tenet ecclesia nec a conciliis instituta reperiuntur, credibile est ab apostolorum traditione descendisse.* Now suppose this rule probable, that's the most, yet it is not certain; it might come by custom, whose original was not known, but yet could not derive from an apostolical principle. Now when they conclude of particular traditions by a general rule, and that general rule not certain, but at the most probable, in any thing, and certainly false in some things, it is wonder if the productions, that is, their judgments and pretence, fail so often. And if I should but instance in all the particulars in which tradition was pretended falsely or uncertainly in the first ages, I should multiply them to a troublesome variety: for it was then accounted so glorious a thing to have spoken with the persons of the apostles, that if any man could with any colour pretend to it, he might abuse the whole church, and obtrude what he listed under the specious title of apostolical tradition; and it is very notorious to every man that will but read and observe the Recognitions or *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus, where there is enough of such false wares shewed in every book, and pretended to be no less than from the apostles. In the first age after the apostles, Papias pretended he received a tradition from the apostles that Christ before the day of judgment should reign a thousand years upon earth, and His saints with Him in temporal felicities; and this thing proceeding from so great an authority as the testimony of Papias, drew after it all or most of the Christians in the first three hundred years. For besides that the millenary opinion is expressly taught[f] by Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Lactantius, Severus, Victorinus, Apollinaris, Nepos, and divers others famous in their time; Justin Martyr in his Dialogue against Tryphon[g] says it was the belief of all Christians exactly orthodox, καὶ εἰ τινές εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα χριστιανοὶ· and yet there was no such tradition, but a mistake in Papias: but I find it no where spoke against till Dionysius of Alexandria[h] confuted Nepos' book, and converted Coracion the Egyptian from the opinion. Now if a tradition whose beginning of being called so began with a

[e] Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. [al. ep. liv. cap. 1. tom. ii. col. 124.] De bapt. contr. Donat., lib. iv. cap. 24. [tom. ix. col. 140.]

[f] [For references to these authorities, see Whitby on the Millennium, and Mede and Daillé as there referred to.]

[g] [§ 80. p. 178.]

[h] [Euseb. hist. eccles. vii. 24.]

scholar of the apostles (for so was Papias) and then continued for some ages upon the mere authority of so famous a man, did yet deceive the church; much more fallible is the pretence, when two or three hundred years after it but commences, and then by some learned man is first called a tradition apostolical. And so it happened in the case of the Arian heresy, which the Nicene fathers did confute by objecting a contrary tradition apostolical, as Theodoret[i] reports; and yet if they had not had better arguments from scripture than from tradition, they would have failed much in so good a cause; for this very pretence the Arians themselves made, and desired to be tried by the fathers of the first three hundred years[k], which was a confutation sufficient to them who pretended a clear tradition, because it was unimaginable that the tradition should leap so as not to come from the first to the last by the middle. But that this trial was sometime declined by that excellent man S. Athanasius, although at other times confidently and truly pretended, it was an argument the tradition was not so clear[l] but both sides might with some fairness pretend to it. And therefore, one of the prime founders of their heresy, the heretic Artemon[m], having observed the advantage might be taken by any sect that would pretend tradition, because the medium was plausible, and consisting of so many particulars that it was hard to be redargued, pretended a tradition from the apostles that Christ was ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, and that the tradition did descend by a constant succession in the church of Rome to pope Victor's time inclusively, and till Zephyrinus had interrupted the series and corrupted the doctrine; which pretence, if it had not had some appearance of truth so as possibly to abuse the church, had not been worthy of confutation, which yet was with care undertaken by an old writer, out of whom Eusebius transcribes a large passage to reprove the vanity of the pretender. But I observe from hence that it was usual to pretend to tradition, and that it was easier pretended than confuted, and I doubt not but oftener done than discovered. A great question arose in Africa concerning the baptism of heretics, whether it were valid or no; S. Cyprian and his party appealed to scripture; Stephen bishop of Rome and his party would be judged by custom and tradition ecclesiastical. See how much the nearer the question was to a determination; either that probation was not accounted by S. Cyprian, and the bishops both of Asia and Africa, to be a good argument, and sufficient to determine them, or there was no certain tradition against them; for unless one of these two do it, nothing could excuse them from opposing a known truth, unless peradventure S. Cyprian, Fir-

[i] Lib. i. hist. c. 8. [al. 7. tom. iii. p. 759 sqq.]

[k] Vide Petav. in Epiphan. hær. lxix. [tom. ii. p. 288.]

[l] Καὶ γάρ εἰσί τινες, ὦ φίλοι, ἔλεγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποφαινόμενοι· οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι, οὐδὲ ἂν πλεῖστοι ταὐτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἴποιεν.—Justin. Mart. dial. ad Tryph. Jud. [§ 48. p. 144.]

[m] Euseb., l. v. c. ult. [p. 251 sqq.]

milian, the bishops of Galatia, Cappadocia, and almost two parts of the world, were ignorant of such a tradition, for they knew of none such, and some of them expressly denied it. And the sixth[o] general synod approves of the canon made in the council of Carthage under Cyprian upon this very ground, because *in prædictorum præsulum locis et solum*[p] *secundum traditam eis consuetudinem servatus est;* they had a particular tradition for rebaptization, and therefore there could be no tradition universal against it; or if there were, they knew not of it, but much for the contrary: and then it would be remembered that a concealed tradition was like a silent thunder, or a law not promulgated; it neither was known, nor was obligatory. And I shall observe this too, that this very tradition was so obscure, and was so obscurely delivered, silently proclaimed, that S. Austin, who disputed against the Donatists upon this very question, was not able to prove it but by a consequence which he thought probable and credible, as appears in his discourse against the Donatists. "The apostles," saith S. Austin[q], "prescribed nothing in this particular; but this custom which is contrary to Cyprian, ought to be believed to have come from their tradition, as many other things which the catholic church observes." That's all the ground and all the reason; nay, the church did waver concerning that question, and before the decision of a council Cyprian and others might dissent without breach of charity[r]. It was plain then there was no clear tradition in the question; possibly there might be a custom in some churches postnate to the times of the apostles, but nothing that was obligatory, no tradition apostolical. But this was a suppletory device ready at hand whenever they needed it; and S. Austin[s] confuted the Pelagians in the question of original sin, by the custom of exorcism and insufflation[t], which S. Austin said came from the apostles by tradition; which yet was then and is now so impossible to be proved, that he that shall affirm it shall gain only the reputation of a bold man and a confident.

4. Secondly I consider, if the report of traditions in the primitive times, so near the ages apostolical, was so uncertain that they were fain to aim at them by conjectures and grope as in the dark, the uncertainty is much increased since; because there are many famous writers whose works are lost, which yet if they had continued, they might have been good records to us, as Clemens Romanus, Hegesippus, Nepos, Coracion, Dionysius Areopagite, of Alexandria, of Corinth, Firmilian, and many more: and since we see pretences have been made without reason in those ages where they might better have been confuted than now they can, it is greater prudence to suspect

[o] [al. Quinisext. sive in Trull.] can. ii. [tom. iii. col. 1660.]

[p] [καὶ μονόν, Gr. 'solum,' Lat. scil. Gent. Hervet. interpr.]

[q] L. v. De baptism. contr. Donat. c. 23. [tom. ix. col. 156.]

[r] Lib. i. De baptism., c. 18. [tom. ix. col. 93 sq.]

[s] De peccat. original., l. ii. c. 40. contra Pelagi. et Cælest. [tom. x. col. 273.]

[t] ['exsufflatio,' lat.]

any later pretences, since so many sects have been, so many wars, so many corruptions in authors, so many authors lost, so much ignorance hath intervened, and so many interests have been served, that now the rule is to be altered: and whereas it was of old time credible that that was apostolical whose beginning they knew not, now quite contrary, we cannot safely believe them to be apostolical unless we do know their beginning to have been from the apostles. For this consisting of probabilities and particulars, which put together make up a moral demonstration, the argument which I now urge hath been growing these fifteen hundred years; and if anciently there was so much as to evacuate the authority of tradition, much more is there now absolutely to destroy it, when all the particulars which time and infinite variety of human accidents have been amassing together are now concentred, and are united by way of constipation. Because every age, and every great change, and every heresy, and every interest, hath increased the difficulty of finding out true traditions.

5. Thirdly, there are very many traditions which are lost, and yet they are concerning matters of as great consequence as most of those questions for the determination whereof traditions are pretended: it is more than probable that as in baptism and the eucharist the very forms of ministration are transmitted to us, so also in confirmation and ordination; and that there were special directions for visitation of the sick, and explicit interpretations of those difficult places of S. Paul which S. Peter affirmed to be so difficult that the ignorant do wrest them to their own damnation; and yet no church hath conserved these, or those many more which S. Basil[u] affirms to be so many, that ἐπιλείψει με ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ ἄγραφα τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια διηγούμενον, 'the day would fail him in the very simple enumeration of all traditions ecclesiastical.' And if the church hath failed in keeping the great variety of traditions, it will hardly be thought a fault in a private person to neglect tradition, which either the whole church hath very much neglected inculpably, or else the whole church is very much to blame. And who can ascertain us, that she hath not entertained some which are no traditions, as well as lost thousands that are? That she did entertain some false traditions I have already proved; but it is also as probable that some of those which these ages did propound for traditions are not so, as it is certain that some which the first ages called traditions were nothing less.

6. Fourthly, there are some opinions which when they began to be publicly received began to be accounted prime traditions, and so became such not by a native title but by adoption; and nothing is more usual than for the fathers to colour their popular opinion with so great an appellative. S. Austin[x] called the communicating of infants an apostolical tradition, and yet we do not practise it because

[u] Cap. xxvii. de Spir. Sancto. [tom. iii. p. 56.]

[x] [passim. See Bingham, Antiquities, bk. xv. chap. 4. § 7.]

we disbelieve the allegation. And that every custom which at first introduction was but a private fancy or singular practice, grew afterwards into a public rite, and went for a tradition after a while continuance, appears by Tertullian[y], who seems to justify it; *Non enim existimas tu licitum esse cuicunque fideli constituere quod Deo placere illi visum fuerit, ad disciplinam et salutem?* And again, *A quocunque traditore censetur, nec auctorem respicias sed auctoritatem.* And S. Hierome[z] most plainly, *Præcepta majorum apostolicas traditiones quisque existimat.* And when Irenæus[a] had observed that great variety in the keeping of Lent, which yet to be a forty-days' fast is pretended to descend from tradition apostolical, some fasting but one day before Easter, some two, some forty, and this even long before Irenæus' time, he gives this reason, *Varietas illa jejunii cœpit apud majores nostros, qui non accurate consuetudinem eorum qui vel simplicitate quadam vel privata auctoritate aliquid in posterum tempus statuissent observarunt* [*Ex translatione Christophorsoni.*] And there are yet some points of good concernment, which if any man should question in a high manner, they would prove indeterminable by scripture, or sufficient reason; and yet I doubt not their confident defenders would say they are opinions of the church, and quickly pretend a tradition from the very apostles, and believe themselves so secure that they could not be discovered, because the question never having been disputed gives them occasion to say, that which had no beginning known was certainly from the apostles. For why should not divines do in the question of reconfirmation as in that of rebaptization? Are not the grounds equal from an indelible character in one as in the other? and if it happen such a question as this after contestation should be determined, not by any positive decree, but by the cession of one part, and the authority and reputation of the other, does not the next age stand fair to be abused with a pretence of tradition, in the matter of reconfirmation, which never yet came to a serious question? For so it was in the question of rebaptization, for which there was then no more evident tradition than there is now in the question of reconfirmation, as I proved formerly, but yet it was carried upon that title.

7. Fifthly, there is great variety in the probation of tradition, so that whatever is proved to be tradition is not equally and alike credible; for nothing but universal tradition is of itself credible; other traditions in their just proportion as they partake of the degrees of universality. Now that a tradition be universal, or, which is all one, that it be a credible testimony, S. Irenæus[b] requires that tradition should derive from all the churches apostolical. And therefore according to this rule there was no sufficient medium to determine the question about Easter, because the eastern and western

[y] Contra Marcion. [?]—De coron. milit. c. 3. et 4. [p. 101 sqq.]

[z] [vid. ep. liii. (tom. iv. part. 2. col. 579) et passim.]

[a] Apud Euseb., l. v. c. 24. [p. 248.]

[b] Lib. iii. c. 4. [p. 178.]

churches had several traditions respectively, and both pretended from the apostles. Clemens Alexandrinus[c] says it was a secret tradition from the apostles that Christ preached but one year: but Irenæus[d] says it did derive from heretics; and says that he by tradition first from S. John, and then from his disciples, received another tradition, that Christ was almost fifty years old when he died, and so by consequence preached almost twenty years: both of them were deceived, and so had all that had believed the report of either pretending tradition apostolical. Thus the custom in the Latin church of fasting on Saturday was against that tradition which the Greeks had from the apostles; and therefore by this division and want of consent, which was the true tradition was so absolutely indeterminable that both must needs lose much of their reputation. But how then when not only particular churches, but single persons, are all the proof we have for a tradition? And this often happened. I think S. Austin[e] is the chief argument and authority we have for the assumption of the Virgin Mary. The baptism of infants is called a tradition by Origen alone at first, and from him by others. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, which is an article the Greek church disavows, derives from the tradition apostolical as it is pretended; and yet before S. Austin we hear nothing of it very clearly or certainly, forasmuch as that whole mystery concerning the blessed Spirit was so little explicated in scripture, and so little derived to them by tradition, that till the council of Nice you shall hardly find any form of worship or personal address of devotion to the Holy Spirit, as Erasmus[f] observes, and I think the contrary will hardly be verified. And for this particular in which I instance, whatsoever is in scripture concerning it is against that which the church of Rome calls tradition, which makes the Greeks so confident as they are of the point, and is an argument of the vanity of some things which for no greater reason are called traditions but because one man hath said so, and that they can be proved by no better argument to be true. Now in this case wherein tradition descends upon us with unequal certainty, it would be very unequal to require of us an absolute belief of every thing not written, for fear we be accounted to slight tradition apostolical. And since nothing can require our supreme assent but that which is truly catholic and apostolic, and to such a tradition is required, as Irenæus says, the consent of all those churches which the apostles planted and where they did preside, this topic will be of so little use in judging heresies, that (besides what is deposited in scripture) it cannot be proved in any thing but in the canon of scrip-

[c] Strom., lib. i. [cap. 21. p. 407.]

[d] Lib. ii. c. 39. [al. 22. p. 148.] 'Omnes seniores testantur, qui in Asia apud Johannem, discipulum Domini, convenerunt, id ipsum tradidisse eis Johannem,' &c. 'et qui alios apostolos viderunt, hæc eadem ab ipsis audierunt, et testantur de ejusmodi relatione.'

[e] Salmeron. [lib. ii.] disput. 51 in Rom. [tom. xiii. p. 467 sqq.]

[f] [In apol. adv. Monach. Hispan., tom. ix. col. 1052.]

ture itself; and as it is now received, even in that there is some variety.

8. And therefore there is wholly a mistake in this business; for when the fathers appeal to tradition, and with much earnestness and some clamour they call upon heretics to conform to or to be tried by tradition, it is such a tradition as delivers the fundamental points of christianity which were also recorded in scripture. But because the canon was not yet perfectly consigned, they called to that testimony they had, which was the testimony of the churches apostolical, whose bishops and priests being the *antistites religionis* did believe and preach christian religion and conserve all its great mysteries according as they have been taught. Irenæus[g] calls this a tradition apostolical, *Christum accepisse calicem et dixisse sanguinem suum esse, et docuisse novam oblationem novi Testamenti quam ecclesia per apostolos accipiens offert per totum mundum.* And the fathers in these ages confute heretics by ecclesiastical tradition; that is, they confront against their impious and blasphemous doctrines that religion, which the apostles having taught to the churches where they did preside, their successors did still preach, and for a long while together suffered not the enemy to sow tares amongst their wheat. And yet these doctrines which they called traditions were nothing but such fundamental truths which were in scripture, πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς, as Irenæus in Eusebius[h] observes, in the instance of Polycarpus: and it is manifest by considering what heresies they fought against, the heresies of Ebion, Cerinthus, Nicolaitans, Valentinians, Carpocratians[i], persons that denied the Son of God, the unity of the Godhead, that preached impurity, that practised sorcery and witchcraft. And now that they did rather urge tradition against them than scripture, was because the public doctrine of all the apostolical churches was at first more known and famous than many parts of the scripture, and because some heretics denied S. Luke's gospel, some received none but S. Matthew's, some rejected all S. Paul's epistles, and it was a long time before the whole canon was consigned by universal testimony, some churches having one part, some another, Rome herself had not all; so that in this case the argument from tradition was the most famous, the most certain, and the most prudent. And now according to this rule they had more traditions than we have, and traditions did by degrees lessen as they came to be written, and their necessity was less as the knowledge of them was ascertained to us by a better keeper of divine truths. All that great mysteriousness of Christ's priesthood, the unity of His sacrifice, Christ's advocation and intercession for us in heaven, and many other excellent doctrines, might very well be accounted traditions before S. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews was published to all the world; but now they are written truths, and if they had not, possibly we might either have lost them

[g] [lib. iv. cap. 32.]
[h] Lib. v. cap. 20. [p. 239.]
[i] Vid. Irenæ. l. iii. et iv. cont. hæres. [p. 173 sqq.]

quite, or doubted of them, as we do of many other traditions by reason of the insufficiency of the propounder. And therefore it was that S. Peter[k] took order that the gospel should be writ, for he had promised that he would do something which after his decease should have these things in remembrance. He knew it was not safe trusting the report of men, where the fountain might quickly run dry, or be corrupted so insensibly that no cure could be found for it, nor any just notice taken of it till it were incurable. And indeed there is scarce any thing but what is written in scripture that can with any confidence of argument pretend to derive from the apostles, except rituals and manners of ministration; but no doctrines or speculative mysteries are so transmitted to us by so clear a current that we may see a visible channel, and trace it to the primitive fountains. It is said to be a tradition apostolical that no priest should baptize without chrism and the command of the bishop; suppose it were, yet we cannot be obliged to believe it with much confidence because we have but little proof for it, scarce any thing but the single testimony of S. Hierome[l]. And yet if it were, this is but a ritual, of which in passing by I shall give that account; that suppose this and many more rituals did derive clearly from tradition apostolical (which yet but very few do) yet it is hard that any church should be charged with crime for not observing such rituals, because we see some of them which certainly did derive from the apostles are expired and gone out in a desuetude; such as are abstinence from blood[m] and from things strangled, the cœnobitic life of secular persons, the college of widows, to worship standing upon the Lord's day, to give milk and honey to the newly baptized, and many more of the like nature; now there having been no mark to distinguish the necessity of one from the indifferency of the other, they are all alike necessary or alike indifferent; if the former, why does no church observe them? If the latter, why does the church of Rome charge upon others the shame of novelty for leaving of some rites and ceremonies which by her own practice we are taught to have no obligation in them but to be adiaphorous? S. Paul[n] gave order that 'a bishop should be the husband of one wife,' the church of Rome will not allow so much, other churches allow more; the apostles commanded Christians to fast on Wednesday and Friday, as appears in their canons, the church of Rome fasts Friday and Saturday and not on Wednesday; the apostles had their *agapæ* or love-feasts, we should believe them scandalous; they used a kiss of charity in ordinary addresses, the church of Rome keeps it only in their mass, other churches quite omit it; the apostles permitted priests and deacons to live in conjugal society, as appears in the fifth canon of the apostles (which to them is an argument who believe them such) and yet the church of Rome by no

[k] 2 Pet. i. [15.]

[l] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 295.]

[m] [cf. 'Duct. dubit.,' bk. ii. chap. 2. rule 2.]

[n] [1 Tim. iii. 2.]

means will endure it; nay more, Michael Medina[o] gives testimony that of eighty-four canons apostolical which Clemens collected scarce six or eight are observed by the Latin church, and Peresius[p] gives this account of it, *In illis contineri multa quæ . . temporum corruptione non plene observantur, aliis pro temporis et materiæ qualitate aut obliteratis aut totius ecclesiæ magisterio . . abrogatis:* now it were good that they which take a liberty to themselves should also allow the same to others. So that for one thing or other, all traditions excepting those very few that are absolutely universal will lose all their obligation, and become no competent medium to confine men's practices, or limit their faiths, or determine their persuasions. Either for the difficulty of their being proved, the incompetency of the testimony that transmits them, or the indifferency of the thing transmitted, all traditions both ritual and doctrinal are disabled from determining our consciences either to a necessary believing or obeying.

9. Sixthly, To which I add by way of confirmation, that there are some things called traditions, and are offered to be proved to us by a testimony which is either false or not extant. Clemens of Alexandria[q] pretended it a tradition that the apostles preached to them that died in infidelity, even after their death, and then raised them to life; but he proved it only by the testimony of the book of Hermas: he affirmed[r] it to be a tradition apostolical that the Greeks were saved by their philosophy, but he had no other authority for it but the apocryphal books of Peter and Paul. Tertullian[s] and S. Basil pretended it an apostolical tradition to sign in the air with the sign of the cross, but this was only consigned to them in the gospel of Nicodemus[t]. But to instance once for all in the epistle of Marcellus to the bishop of Antioch[u], where he affirms that it is the canon of the apostles, *præter sententiam Romani pontificis non posse concilia celebrari.* And yet there is no such canon extant, nor ever was, for aught appears in any record we have; and yet the collection of the canons is so entire that though it hath something more than what was apostolical, yet it had nothing less.—And now that I am casually fallen upon an instance from the canons of the apostles, I consider that there cannot in the world a greater instance be given how easy it is to be abused in the believing of traditions. For first, to the first fifty which many did admit for apostolical, thirty-five more were added which most men now count spurious, all men call dubious, and some of them universally condemned by peremptory sentence, even by them who are

[o] De sacr. hom. continent., lib. v. c. 105. [p. 526. fol. Venet. 1569.]

[p] De tradit., part. iii. c. de auctor. can. apost. [p. 243. 8vo. Paris. 1562.]

[q] [Strom., lib. ii. cap. 9. p. 452.]

[r] [Lib. i. cap. 20; et vi. 5. pp. 377, 761.]

[s] [vid. De coron. mil., cap. 3. fin. p. 102 B.]

[t] [vid. Fabric. Pseudepigr. Nov. Test.]

[u] [Epist. i. 'Ad episcopos Antiochenæ provinciæ,' in Concil. Reg. tom. i. p. 621.—'Juxta apostolorum eorumque successorum sanctiones,' &c.—'Simulque iidem . . constituerunt ut nulla synodus fieret præter ejusdem sedis auctoritatem,' &c.]

greatest admirers of that collection, as the sixty-fifth, sixty-seventh, and eighty-fourth (or eighty-fifth[x]) canons. For the first fifty, it is evident that there are some things so mixed with them and no mark of difference left, that the credit of all is much impaired, insomuch that Isidore of Seville[y] says 'they were apocryphal, made by heretics, and published under the title Apostolical, but neither the fathers nor the church of Rome did give assent to them:' and yet they have prevailed so far amongst some that Damascene[z] is of opinion they should be received equally with the canonical writings of the apostles. One thing only I observe (and we shall find it true in most writings whose authority is urged in questions of theology) that the authority of the tradition is not it which moves the assent, but the nature of the thing; and because such a canon is delivered they do not therefore believe the sanction or proposition so delivered, but disbelieve the tradition if they do not like the matter; and so do not judge of the matter by the tradition, but of the tradition by the matter. And thus the church of Rome rejects the eighty-fourth (or eighty-fifth) canon of the apostles, not because it is delivered with less authority than the last thirty-five are, but because it reckons the canon of scripture otherwise than it is at Rome. Thus also the fifth canon amongst the first fifty, because it approves the marriage of priests and deacons, does not persuade them to approve of it too, but itself becomes suspected for approving it; so that either they accuse themselves of palpable contempt of the apostolical authority, or else that the reputation of such traditions is kept up to serve their own ends, and therefore when they encounter them they are no more to be upheld; which what else is it but to teach all the world to contemn such pretences and undervalue traditions, and to supply to others a reason why they should do that which to them that give the occasion is most unreasonable?

10. Seventhly, the testimony of the ancient church being the only means of proving tradition, and sometimes their dictates and doctrine being the tradition pretended of necessity to be imitated, it is considerable that men, in their estimate of it, take their rise from several ages and differing testimonies, and are not agreed about the competency of their testimony; and the reasons that on each side make them differ, are such as make the authority itself the less authentic and more repudiable. Some will allow only of the three first ages, as being most pure, most persecuted, and therefore most holy, least interested, serving fewer designs, having fewest factions, and therefore more likely to speak the truth for God's sake and its own, as best complying with their great end of acquiring heaven in recompense of losing their lives; others[a] say that those ages, being perse-

[x] ['84,' edd.]

[y] Apud Gratian. dist. xvi. c. 'Canones.' [scil. c. 1. col. 63.]

[z] Lib. iv. c. 18. de orthod. fide. [leg. cap. 17 fin. tom. i. p. 284.]

[a] Vid. Car. Perron, Lettre au sieur Casaubon, [prefixed to the 'Replique au Roi de Bretagne.']

cuted, minded the present doctrines proportionable to their purposes and constitution of the ages, and make little or nothing of those questions which at this day vex christendom. And both speak true: the first ages speak greatest truth, but least pertinently; the next ages, the ages of the four general councils, spake something, not much more pertinently to the present questions, but were not so likely to speak true by reason of their dispositions contrary to the capacity and circumstance of the first ages; and if they speak wisely as doctors, yet not certainly as witnesses of such propositions which the first ages noted not, and yet unless they had noted, could not possibly be traditions. And therefore either of them will be less useless as to our present affairs. For indeed the questions which now are the public trouble were not considered or thought upon for many hundred years, and therefore prime tradition there is none as to our purpose, and it will be an insufficient medium to be used or pretended in the determination; and to dispute concerning the truth or necessity of traditions in the questions of our times, is as if historians, disputing about a question in the English story, should fall on wrangling whether Livy or Plutarch were the best writers. And the earnest disputes about traditions are to no better purpose; for no church at this day admits the one half of those things which certainly by the fathers were called traditions apostolical, and no testimony of ancient writers does consign the one half of the present questions to be or not to be traditions. So that they who admit only the doctrine and testimony of the first ages cannot be determined in most of their doubts which now trouble us, because their writings are of matters wholly differing from the present disputes: and they which would bring in after ages to the authority of a competent judge or witness, say the same thing; for they plainly confess that the first ages spake little or nothing to the present question, or at least nothing to their sense of them; for therefore they call in aid from the following ages, and make them suppletory and auxiliary to their designs; and therefore there are no traditions to our purposes. And they who would willingly have it otherwise, yet have taken no course it should be otherwise; for they, when they had opportunity in the councils of the last ages to determine what they had a mind to, yet they never named the number, nor expressed the particular traditions which they would fain have the world believe to be apostolical: but they have kept the bridle in their own hands, and made a reserve of their own power, that if need be they may make new pretensions, or not be put to it to justify the old by the engagement of a conciliary declaration.

11. Lastly, we are acquitted by the testimony of the primitive fathers from any other necessity of believing, than of such articles as are recorded in scripture; and this is done by them whose authority is pretended the greatest argument for tradition, as appears largely in Irenæus[b], who disputes professedly for the sufficiency of scripture

[b] Lib. iii. c. 2. contr. hæres. [p. 174.]

against certain heretics who affirm some necessary truths not to be written. It was an excellent saying of S. Basil (and will never be wiped out with all the eloquence of Perron) in his *Serm. de Fide*[c], *Manifestus est fidei lapsus et liquidum superbiæ vitium, vel respuere aliquid eorum quæ scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod scriptum non est.* And it is but a poor device to say that every particular tradition is consigned in scripture by those places which give authority to tradition, and so the introducing of tradition is not a superinducing any thing over or besides scripture, because tradition is like a messenger, and the scripture is like his letters of credence, and therefore authorizes whatsoever tradition speaketh. For supposing scripture does consign the authority of tradition (which it might do before all the whole instrument of scripture itself was consigned, and then afterwards there might be no need of tradition, yet supposing it) it will follow that all those traditions which are truly prime and apostolical are to be entertained according to the intention of the deliverers; which indeed is so reasonable of itself that we need not scripture to persuade us to it, itself is authentic as scripture is if it derives from the same fountain, and a word is never the more the word of God for being written, nor the less for not being written: but it will not follow that whatsoever is pretended to be tradition is so, neither is the credit of the particular instances consigned in scripture, *et dolosus versatur in generalibus,* but that this craft is too palpable. And if a general and indefinite consignation of tradition be sufficient to warrant every particular that pretends to be tradition, then S. Basil had spoken to no purpose by saying it is pride and apostasy from the faith to bring in what is not written: for if either any man brings in what is written, or what he says is delivered, then the first being express scripture and the second being consigned in scripture, no man can be charged with superinducing what is not written, he hath his answer ready; and then these are zealous words absolutely to no purpose: but if such general consignation does not warrant every thing that pretends to tradition, but only such as are truly proved to be apostolical, then scripture is useless as to this particular; for such tradition gives testimony to scripture, and therefore is of itself first, and more credible, for it is credible of itself; and therefore unless S. Basil thought that all the will of God in matters of faith and doctrine were written, I see not what end, nor what sense, he could have in these words: for no man in the world, except enthusiasts and madmen, ever obtruded a doctrine upon the church but he pretended scripture for it, or tradition; and therefore no man could be pressed by these words, no man confuted, no man instructed, no, not enthusiasts or Montanists. For suppose either of them should say that since in scripture the Holy Ghost is promised to abide with the church for ever, to teach whatever they pretend the Spirit in any age hath taught them is not to superinduce any thing beyond what is

[c] [§ 1. tom. ii. p. 224.]

written, because the truth of the Spirit, His veracity, and His perpetual teaching, being promised and attested in scripture, scripture hath just so consigned all such revelations, as Perron[d] saith it hath all such traditions;—But I will trouble myself no more with arguments from any human authorities; but he that is surprised with the belief of such authorities, and will but consider the very many testimonies of antiquity to this purpose, as of Constantine[e], S. Hierome[f], S. Austin[g], S. Athanasius[h], S. Hilary[i], S. Epiphanius[k], and divers others, all speaking words to the same sense with that saying of S. Paul[l], *Nemo sentiat super quod scriptum est*, will see that there is reason, that since no man is materially a heretic but he that errs in a point of faith, and all faith is sufficiently recorded in scripture, the judgment of faith and heresy is to be derived from thence, and no man is to be condemned for dissenting in an article for whose probation tradition only is pretended; only according to the degree of its evidence let every one determine himself, but of this evidence we must not judge for others: for unless it be in things of faith, and absolute certainties, evidence is a word of relation, and so supposes two terms, the object and the faculty; and it is an imperfect speech to say a thing is evident in itself (unless we speak of first principles, or clearest revelations) for that may be evident to one that is not so to another, by reason of the pregnancy of some apprehensions and the immaturity of others.

This discourse hath its intention in traditions doctrinal and ritual, that is, such traditions which propose articles new *in materia;* but now if scripture be the repository of all divine truths sufficient for us, tradition must be considered as its instrument, to convey its great mysteriousness to our understandings: it is said there are traditive interpretations as well as traditive propositions, but these have not much distinct consideration in them, both because their uncertainty is as great as the other upon the former considerations, as also because in very deed there are no such things as traditive interpretations universal: for as for particulars, they signify no more but that they are not sufficient determinations of questions theological, therefore because they are particular, contingent, and of infinite variety; and they are no more argument than the particular authority of these men whose commentaries they are, and therefore must be considered with them.

12. The sum is this: since the fathers, who are the best witnesses of traditions, yet were infinitely deceived in their account; since sometimes they guessed at them, and conjectured by way of rule and discourse, and not of their knowledge, not by evidence of the thing;

[d] [Replique au roi, &c., l. ii. observ. 5. chap. 5. p. 754.]
[e] Orat. ad Nicæn. pp. apud Theodor., lib. i. c. 7. [al. 6. tom. iii. p. 757.]
[f] In Matth., l. iv. cap. 23. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 112.] et in Aggæum. [passim; tom. iii. col. 1684 sqq.]
[g] De bono viduit. c. i. [tom. vi. col. 369.]
[h] Orat. cont. gent. [§ 1. tom. i. p. 1.]
[i] In psalm. cxxxii. [§ 6. col. 463 E.]
[k] Lib. ii. contr. hær., tom. i. hær. lxi. [p. 506 sqq.]
[l] 1 Cor. iv. [6.]

since many are called traditions which were not so, many are uncertain whether they were or no, yet confidently pretended, and this uncertainty, which at first was great enough, is increased by infinite causes and accidents in the succession of sixteen hundred years; since the church hath been either so careless or so abused that she could not or would not preserve traditions with carefulness and truth; since it was ordinary for the old writers to set out their own fancies, and the rites of their church which had been ancient, under the specious title of apostolical traditions; since some traditions rely but upon single testimony at first, and yet descending upon others come to be attested by many, whose testimony though conjunct yet in value is but single, because it relies upon the first single relator, and so can have no greater authority or certainty than they derive from the single person; since the first ages who were most competent to consign tradition, yet did consign such traditions as be of a nature wholly discrepant from the present questions, and speak nothing at all or very imperfectly to our purposes; and the following ages are no fit witnesses of that which was not transmitted to them, because they could not know it at all but by such transmission and prior consignation; since what at first was a tradition came afterwards to be written, and so ceased its being a tradition, yet the credit of traditions commenced upon the certainty and reputation of those truths first delivered by word, afterward consigned by writing; since what was certainly tradition apostolical, as many rituals were, are rejected by the church in several ages, and are gone out into a desuetude; and lastly, since beside the no necessity of traditions, there being abundantly enough in scripture, there are many things called traditions by the fathers which they themselves either proved by no authors, or by apocryphal and spurious and heretical: the matter of tradition will in very much be so uncertain, so false, so suspicious, so contradictory, so improbable, so unproved, that if a question be contested and be offered to be proved only by tradition, it will be very hard to impose such a proposition to the belief of all men with any imperiousness or resolved determination, but it will be necessary men should preserve the liberty of believing and prophesying, and not part with it upon a worse merchandise and exchange than Esau made for his birthright.

§ 6. Of the uncertainty and insufficiency of councils ecclesiastical to the same purpose.

1. But since we are all this while in uncertainty, it is necessary that we should address ourselves somewhere where we may rest the sole of our foot: and nature, scripture, and experience, teach the world in matters of question to submit to some final sentence. For it is not reason that controversies should continue till the erring person shall be willing to condemn himself; and the Spirit of God hath directed us by that great precedent at Jerusalem, to address ourselves to the church, that in a plenary council and assembly she

may synodically determine controversies. So that if a general council have determined a question or expounded scripture, we may no more disbelieve the decree than the Spirit of God himself who speaks in them. And indeed if all assemblies of bishops were like that first, and all bishops were of the same spirit of which the apostles were, I should obey their decree with the same religion as I do them whose preface was *Visum est Spiritui sancto et nobis;* and I doubt not but our blessed Saviour intended that the assemblies of the church should be judges of the[m] controversies, and guides of our persuasions in matters of difficulty. But He also intended they should proceed according to His will which He had revealed, and those precedents which He had made authentic by the immediate assistance of His holy spirit: He hath done His part, but we do not do ours. And if any private person in the simplicity and purity of his soul desires to find out a truth of which he is in search and inquisition, if he prays for wisdom, we have a promise he shall be heard and answered liberally; and therefore much more when the representatives of the catholic church do meet, because every person there hath *in individuo* a title to the promise, and another title as he is a governor and a guide of souls, and all of them together have another title in their united capacity, especially if in that union they pray, and proceed with simplicity and purity; so that there is no disputing against the pretence, and promises, and authority, of general councils. For if any one man can hope to be guided by God's spirit in the search, the pious and impartial and unprejudicate search of truth, then much more may a general council. If no private man can hope for it, then truth is not necessary to be found, nor we are not obliged to search for it, or else we are saved by chance: but if private men can, by virtue of a promise upon certain conditions, be assured of finding out sufficient truth, much more shall a general council. So that I consider thus: there are many promises pretended to belong to general assemblies in the church; but I know not any ground nor any pretence that they shall be absolutely assisted, without any condition on their own parts, and whether they will or no: faith is a virtue as well as charity, and therefore consists in liberty and choice, and hath nothing in it of necessity: there is no question but that they are obliged to proceed according to some rule; for they expect no assistance by way of enthusiasm; if they should, I know no warrant for that, neither did any general council ever offer a decree which they did not think sufficiently proved by scripture, reason, or tradition, as appears in the acts of the councils. Now then, if they be tied to conditions, it is their duty to observe them; but whether it be certain that they will observe them, that they will do all their duty, that they will not sin even in this particular in the neglect of their duty, that's the consideration. So that if any man questions the title and authority of general councils, and whether or no great

[m] ['the' om. A.]

promises appertain to them, I suppose him to be much mistaken; but he also that thinks all of them have proceeded according to rule and reason, and that none of them were deceived, because possibly they might have been truly directed, is a stranger to the history of the church, and to the perpetual instances and experiments of the faults and failings of humanity. It is a famous saying of S. Gregory[n] that he had the four first councils in esteem and veneration next to the four evangelists; I suppose it was because he did believe them to have proceeded according to rule, and to have judged righteous judgment; but why had not he the same opinion of other councils too which were celebrated before his death, for he lived after the fifth general? Not because they had not the same authority, for that which is warrant for one is warrant for all; but because he was not so confident that they did their duty, nor proceeded so without interest as the first four had done, and the following councils did never get that reputation which all the catholic church acknowledged due to the first four. And in the next order were the three following generals; for the Greeks and Latins did never jointly acknowledge but seven generals to have been authentic in any sense, because they were in no sense agreed that any more than seven had proceeded regularly and done their duty: so that now the question is not whether general councils have a promise that the Holy Ghost will assist them: for every private man hath that promise, that if he does his duty he shall be assisted sufficiently in order to that end to which he needs assistance; and therefore much more shall general councils, in order to that end for which they convene and to which they need assistance, that is, in order to the conservation of the faith, for the doctrinal rules of good life, and all that concerns the essential duty of a Christian, but not in deciding questions to satisfy contentious or curious or presumptuous spirits. But now can the bishops so convened be factious, can they be abused with prejudice or transported with interests, can they resist the Holy Ghost, can they extinguish the Spirit, can they stop their ears, and serve themselves upon the Holy Spirit and the pretence of His assistances, and cease to serve Him upon themselves by captivating their understandings to His dictates and their wills to His precepts? Is it necessary they should perform any condition? is there any one duty for them to perform in these assemblies, a duty which they have power to do or not do? If so, then they may fail of it, and not do their duty: and if the assistance of the Holy Spirit be conditional, then we have no more assurance that they are assisted, than that they do their duty, and do not sin.

2. Now let us suppose what this duty is. Certainly if the gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost[o], and all that come to the

[n] [E. g. lib. i. indict. 9. ep. 25.—Lib. iii. indict. 11. ep. 10. tom. ii. coll. 515, 632.]

[o] [2 Cor. iv. 3.]

knowledge of the truth must come to it by such means which are spiritual and holy dispositions, in order to a holy and spiritual end; they must be shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace[p], that is, they must have peaceable and docible dispositions, nothing with them that is violent, and resolute to encounter those gentle and sweet assistances: and the rule they are to follow is the rule which the Holy Spirit hath consigned to the catholic church, that is, the holy scripture, either entirely[q], or at least for the greater part of the rule. So that now if the bishops be factious and prepossessed with persuasions depending upon interest, it is certain they may judge amiss; and if they recede from the rule, it is certain they do judge amiss. And this I say upon their grounds who most advance the authority of general councils; for if a general council may err if a pope confirm it not, then most certainly if in any thing it recede from scripture, it does also err; because that they are to expect the pope's confirmation they offer to prove from scripture: now if the pope's confirmation be required by authority of scripture, and that therefore the defailance of it does evacuate the authority of the council, then also are the councils' decrees invalid if they recede from any other part of scripture; so that scripture is the rule they are to follow: and a man would have thought it had been needless to have proved it, but that we are fallen into ages in which no truth is certain, no reason concluding, nor is there any thing that can convince some men. For Stapleton[r], with extreme boldness against the piety of christendom, against the public sense of the ancient church and the practice of all pious assemblies of bishops, affirms the decrees of a council to be binding, *etiamsi non confirmetur probabili testimonio scripturarum;* nay, though it be quite *extra scripturam;* but all wise and good men have ever said that sense which S. Hilary[s] expressed in these words, *Quæ extra evangelium sunt non defendam;* this was it which the good emperor Constantine[t] propounded to the fathers met at Nice, *Libri evangelici, oracula apostolorum, et veterum prophetarum clare nos instruunt quid sentiendum in divinis.* And this is confessed by a sober man of the Roman church itself, the cardinal of Cusa[u], *Oportet quod omnia talia quæ legere[x] debent, contineantur in auctoritatibus sacrarum scripturarum.* Now then all the advantage I shall take from hence is this, that if the apostles commended them who examined their sermons by their conformity to the law and the prophets, and the men of Berea[y] were accounted 'noble' for 'search-

[p] [Eph. vi. 15.]

[q] Vide Optat. Milev., lib. v. adv. Parm. [cap. 3. p. 81 sq.]—Baldwin. in eundem, [p. 133.] et S. Aug. in psa. xix. expos. 2. [vid. in v. 29 et alibi; tom. iv. col. 101.]

[r] Relect. controv. iv. q. 1. art. 3. [in solutione argum. xii. hæret., tom. i. p. 744 A.—'Etiamsi nullo scripturarum aut evidenti aut probabili testimonio confirmetur.']

[s] Lib. ii. ad Constant. [§ 11. col. 1230.]

[t] Apud Theod., lib. i. c. 7. [al. 6. tom. iii. p. 757.]

[u] Concord. cathol., l. ii. c. 10. [p. 723.]

[x] [leg. 'ligare.']

[y] [Acts xvii. 11.]

ing the scriptures whether those things which they taught were so' or no; I suppose it will not be denied but the councils' decrees may also be tried whether they be conform to scripture, yea or no; and although no man can take cognizance and judge the decrees of a council *pro auctoritate publica*, yet *pro informatione privata* they may; the authority of a council is not greater than the authority of the apostles, nor their dictates more sacred or authentic. Now then put case a council should recede from scripture, whether or no were we bound to believe its decrees? I only ask the question: for it were hard to be bound to believe what to our understanding seems contrary to that which we know to be the word of God: but if we may lawfully recede from the councils' decrees in case they be contrariant to scripture, it is all that I require in this question. For if they be tied to a rule, then they are to be examined and understood according to the rule, and then we are to give ourselves that liberty or judgment which is requisite to distinguish us from beasts, and to put us into a capacity of reasonable people, following reasonable guides. But however, if it be certain that the councils are to follow scripture, then if it be notorious that they do recede from scripture, we are sure we must obey God rather than men, and then we are well enough. For unless we are bound to shut our eyes and not to look upon the sun, if we may give ourselves liberty to believe what seems most plain, and unless the authority of a council be so great a prejudice as to make us to do violence to our understanding, so as not to disbelieve the decree because it seems contrary to scripture, but to believe it agrees with scripture though we know not how, therefore because the council hath decreed it; unless I say we be bound in duty to be so obediently blind and sottish, we are sure that there are some councils which are pretended general, that have retired from the public notorious words and sense of scripture. For what wit of man can reconcile the decree of the thirteenth session of the council of Constance[z] with scripture, in which session the half communion was decreed, in defiance of scripture, and with a *non obstante* to Christ's institution. For in the preface of the decree Christ's institution and the practice of the primitive church is expressed, and then with a *non obstante* communion in one kind is established. Now then suppose the *non obstante* in the form of words relates to the primitive practice, yet since Christ's institution was taken notice of in the first words of the decree, and the decree made quite contrary to it, let the *non obstante* relate whither it will, the decree (not to call it a defiance) is a plain recession from the institution of Christ, and therefore the *non obstante* will refer to that without any sensible error; and indeed for all the excuses to the contrary, the decree was not so discreetly framed but that in the very form of words the defiance and the *non obstante* is too plainly relative to the first words. For what sense can there be in the first *licet* else? *Licet Christus in utraque specie,*

[z] [tom. viii. col. 381 sqq.]

and *licet ecclesia primitiva, &c. tamen hoc non obstante, &c.* the first *licet* being a relative term as well as the second *licet* must be bounded with some correspondent. But it matters not much; let them whom it concerns enjoy the benefit of all excuses they can imagine, it is certain Christ's institution and the council's sanction are as contrary as light and darkness.—Is it possible for any man to contrive a way to make the decree of the council of Trent, commanding the public offices of the church to be in Latin, friends with the fourteenth chapter of the Corinthians? It is not amiss to observe how the hyperaspists of that council sweat to answer the allegations of S. Paul; and the wisest of them do it so extremely poor, that it proclaims to all the world that the strongest man that is cannot eat iron or swallow a rock. Now then, would it not be an unspeakable tyranny to all wise persons (who as much hate to have their souls enslaved as their bodies imprisoned) to command them to believe that these decrees are agreeable to the word of God? Upon whose understanding soever these are imposed, they may at the next session reconcile them to a crime, and make any sin sacred, or persuade him to believe propositions contradictory to a mathematical demonstration. All the arguments in the world that can be brought to prove the infallibility of councils cannot make it so certain that they are infallible, as these two instances do prove infallibly that these were deceived; and if ever we may safely make use of our reason and consider whether councils have erred or no, we cannot by any reason be more assured that they have or have not, than we have in these particulars: so that either our reason is of no manner of use in the discussion of this question, and the thing itself is not at all to be disputed, or if it be, we are certain that these actually were deceived, and we must never hope for a clearer evidence in any dispute. And if these be, others might have been, if they did as these did, that is, depart from their rule. And it was wisely said of Cusanus[a], *Notandum est experimento rerum universale concilium*[b] *posse deficere;* the experience of it is notorious that councils have erred, and all the arguments against experience are but plain sophistry.

3. And therefore I make no scruple to slight the decrees of such councils wherein the proceedings were as prejudicate and unreasonable as in the council wherein Abailardus[c] was condemned, where the presidents having pronounced *Damnamus,* they at the lower end

[a] Lib. ii. c. 14. [leg. 5.] Concordat. cathol. [p. 716.]

[b] [leg. 'universale plenarium,' sc. concilium.]

[c] Epist. Abailardi ad Heliss. conjugem. [Potius, 'Berengarii Apologeticus contra B. Bernardum,' &c.—Berengarius endeavours to turn the whole proceeding against Abelard into ridicule, by giving a grotesque account of the council. 'Inter hæc sonat lector, stertit auditor.—Damnatis? Tunc quidam vix ad extremam syllabam expergefacti, somnolenta voce, capite pendulo, 'Damuamus,' aiebant. Alii vero damnantium tumultu excitati, decapitata prima syllaba, 'Namus,' inquiunt. Vere natis, sed natatio vestra procella, natatio vestra mersio,' &c.—In opp. Abælard. 4to. Paris. 1616. p. 305.]

being awaked at the noise heard the latter part of it, and concurred as far as *Mnamus* went, and that was as good as *Damnamus;* for if they had been awake at the pronouncing the whole word, they would have given sentence accordingly. But by this means S. Bernard numbered the major part of voices against his adversary Abailardus; and as far as these men did do their duty, the duty of priests and judges and wise men, so we may presume them to be assisted, but no further. But I am content this (because but a private assembly) shall pass for no instance: but what shall we say of all the Arian councils celebrated with so great fancy, and such numerous assemblies? we all say that they erred. And it will not be sufficient to say they were not lawful councils; for they were convened by that authority which all the world knows did at that time convocate councils, and by which (as it is confessed[d] and is notorious) the first eight generals did meet, that is, by the authority of the emperor all were called, and as many and more did come to them than came to the most famous council of Nice: so that the councils were lawful; and if they did not proceed lawfully, and therefore did err, this is to say that councils are then not deceived when they do their duty, when they judge impartially, when they decline interest, when they follow their rule; but this says also that it is not infallibly certain that they will do so; for these did not, and therefore the others may be deceived as well as these were.—But another thing is in the wind; for councils not confirmed by the pope have no warrant that they shall not err, and they not being confirmed therefore failed. But whether is the pope's confirmation after the decree or before? It cannot be supposed before, for there is nothing to be confirmed till the decree be made and the article composed. But if it be after, then possibly the pope's decree may be requisite in solemnity of law, and to make the authority popular, public, and human; but the decree is true or false before the pope's confirmation, and is not at all altered by the supervening decree, which being postnate to the decree, alters not what went before: *Nunquam enim crescit ex postfacto præteriti æstimatio,* is the voice both of law and reason. So that it cannot make it divine, and necessary to be heartily believed; it may make it lawful, not make it true; that is, it may possibly by such means become a law, but not a truth. I speak now upon supposition the pope's confirmation were necessary, and required to the making of conciliary and necessary sanctions. But if it were, the case were very hard: for suppose a heresy should invade, and possess the chair of Rome, what remedy can the church have in that case, if a general council be of no authority without the pope confirm it? will the pope confirm a council against himself? will he condemn his own heresy? That the pope may be a heretic appears in the canon law[e], which says he may for heresy be deposed, and therefore by a

[d] Cusanus, l. ii. cap. 25. Concord. [p. 756.]

[e] [Gratian. decret.] dist. xl. can. [6.] 'Si papa.' [col. 212.]

council, which in this case hath plenary authority without the pope. And therefore in the synod at Rome[f] held under pope Adrian the second, the censure of the sixth synod against Honorius, who was convict of heresy, is approved with this appendix, that in this case, the case of heresy, *minores possint de majoribus judicare:* and therefore if a pope were above a council, yet when the question is concerning heresy the case is altered; the pope may be judged by his inferiors, who in this case, which is the main case of all, become his superiors. And it is little better than impudence to pretend that all councils were confirmed by the pope, or that there is a necessity in respect of divine obligation that any should be confirmed by him more than by another of the patriarchs. For the council of Chalcedon itself, one of those four which S. Gregory[g] did revere next to the four evangelists, is rejected by pope Leo[h], who in his fifty-third epistle to Anatolius, and in his fifty-fourth to Martian, and in his fifty-fifth to Pulcheria, accuses it of ambition and inconsiderate temerity, and therefore no fit assembly for the habitation of the Holy Spirit; and Gelasius[i] in his tome *De vinculo anathematis* affirms that the council is in part to be received, in part to be rejected, and compares it to heretical books of a mixed matter, and proves his assertion by the place of S. Paul, *Omnia probate, quod bonum est retinete.*—And Bellarmine[k] says the same, *In concilio Chalcedonensi quædam sunt bona, quædam mala, quædam recipienda, quædam rejicienda; ita et in libris hæreticorum;* and if any thing be false, then all is questionable, and judicable, and discernible, and not infallible antecedently. And however that council hath *ex post facto,* and by the voluntary consenting of after ages, obtained great reputation; yet they that lived immediately after it, that observed all the circumstances of the thing, and the disabilities of the persons, and the uncertainty of the truth of its decrees, by reason of the unconcludingness of the arguments brought to attest it, were of another mind: *Quod autem ad concilium Chalcedonense attinet, illud id temporis* (*viz. Anastasii Imp.*) *neque palam in ecclesiis sanctissimis prædicatum fuit, neque ab omnibus rejectum; nam singuli ecclesiarum præsides pro suo arbitratu in ea re egerunt*[l]. And so did all men in the world that were not mastered with prejudices, and undone in their understanding with accidental impertinencies; they judged upon those grounds which they had and saw, and suffered not themselves to be bound to the imperious dictates of other men, who are as uncertain in their determinations as other in their questions. And it is an evidence that there is some deception and notable error either in the thing or in the manner of their proceeding, when the decrees of a council shall have no authority from the compilers, nor no strength from the reasonableness of the decision, but from the

[f] [Inter acta concil. Constantinop. iv. tom. v. col. 1079.]
[g] [vid. p. 444. not. n, supra.]
[h] [? p. 129 sqq.]
[i] [Concil. reg., tom. x. p. 162.]
[k] De laicis, lib. iii. cap. 20. § 'Ad hoc ult.' [tom. ii. col. 683 B.]
[l] Evagr., lib. iii. cap. 30. [p. 361.]

accidental approbation of posterity. And if posterity had pleased, Origen had believed well and been an orthodox person. And it was pretty sport to see that Papias was right for two ages together, and wrong ever since; and just so it was in councils, particularly in this of Chalcedon, that had a fate alterable according to the age and according to the climate, which to my understanding is nothing else but an argument that the business of infallibility is a later[m] device, and commenced to serve such ends as cannot be justified by true and substantial grounds; and that the pope should confirm it as of necessity, is a fit cover for the same dish.

4. In the sixth[n] general council Honorius pope of Rome was condemned: did that council stay for the pope's confirmation before they sent forth the decree? Certainly they did not think it so needful as that they would have suspended or cassated the decree in case the pope had then disavowed it: for besides the condemnation of pope Honorius for heresy, the thirteenth and fifty-fifth canons[o] of that council are expressly against the custom of the church of Rome. But this particular is involved in that new question, whether the pope be above a council. Now since the contestation of this question, there was never any free or lawful council that determined for the pope[p], it is not likely any should; and is it likely that any pope will confirm a council that does not? For the council of Basil is therefore condemned by the last Lateran, which was an assembly in the pope's own palace, and the council of Constance is of no value in this question, and slighted in a just proportion as that article is disbelieved. But I will not much trouble the question with a long consideration of this particular; the pretence is senseless and illiterate, against reason and experience, and already determined by S. Austin[q] sufficiently as to this particular, *Ecce putemus illos episcopos qui Romæ judicaverunt non bonos judices fuisse: restabat adhuc plenarium ecclesiæ universæ concilium, ubi etiam cum ipsis judicibus causa posset agitari, ut si male judicasse convicti essent, eorum sententiæ solverentur.* For since popes may be parties, may be simoniacs, schismatics, heretics, it is against reason that in their own causes they should be judges, or that in any causes they should be superior to their judges. And as it is against reason, so is it against all experience too; for the council Sinuessanum (as it is said[r]) was convened to take cognizance of pope Marcellinus; and divers councils were held at Rome to give judgment in causes of Damasus, Sixtus III., Symmachus, and Leo III. and IV., as is to be seen in Platina, and the tomes of the councils. And it is no answer to this and the like allegations to say, in matters of fact and human constitution the pope may be judged by a council,

[m] ['latter' B, C.]
[n] [al. Quinisext. sive in Trull. can. i. tom. iii. col. 1658.]
[o] [coll. 1665, 81.]
[p] Vid. postea de concil. Sinuessano, sect. vi. n. 9. [p. 455, infra.]
[q] Epist. clxii. [al. xliii.] ad Glorium. [cap. 7. tom. ii. col. 97 A.]
[r] ['as it said' A.]

but in matters of faith all the world must stand to the pope's determination and authoritative decision: for if the pope can by any colour pretend to any thing, it is to a supreme judicature in matters ecclesiastical, positive and of fact; and if he fails in this pretence, he will hardly hold up his head for any thing else: for the ancient bishops derived their faith from the fountain, and held that in the highest tenure, even from Christ their head; but by reason of the imperial city it became the principal seat, and he surprised the highest judicature, partly by the concession of others, partly by his own accidental advantages; and yet even in these things, although he was *major singulis*, yet he was *minor universis*. And this is no more than what was decreed of the eighth general synod[t]: which if it be sense, is pertinent to this question; for general councils are appointed to take cognizance of questions and differences about the bishop of Rome, *non tamen audacter in eum ferre sententiam;* by *audacter*, as is supposed, is meant *præcipitanter*, 'hastily and unreasonably:' but if to give sentence against him be wholly forbidden, it is nonsense; for to what purpose is an authority of taking cognizance, if they have no power of giving sentence, unless it were to defer it to a superior judge, which in this case cannot be supposed? For either the pope himself is to judge his own cause after their examination of him, or the general council is to judge him. So that although the council is by that decree enjoined to proceed modestly and warily, yet they may proceed to sentence, or else the decree is ridiculous and impertinent.

5. But to clear all, I will instance in matters of question and opinion: for not only some councils have made their decrees without or against the pope, but some councils have had the pope's confirmation, and yet have not been the more legitimate or obligatory, but are known to be heretical. For the canons of the sixth synod, although some of them were made against the popes and the custom of the church of Rome, a pope a while after did confirm the council; and yet the canons are impious and heretical, and so esteemed by the church of Rome herself. I instance in the second canon[u], which approves of that synod of Carthage under Cyprian for rebaptization of heretics, and the seventy-second canon[v], that dissolves marriage between persons of differing persuasion in matters of christian religion; and yet these canons were approved by pope Adrian I. who in his epistle to Tharasius, which is in the second action of the seventh synod[w], calls them *canones divine et legaliter prædicatos*. And these canons were used by pope Nicholas I.[x] in his epistle *ad Michaelem*, and by Innocent III.[y] c. *'a multis:' extra. 'de ætat. ordinandorum.'* So that now (that we may apply this) there are seven general councils which by

[s] Vid. concil. Chalced., act. xv. [can. 28. tom. ii. col. 614.]
[t] Act. ult. can. 21. [tom. v. col. 909.]
[u] [tom. iii. col. 1660.]
[v] [col. 1688.]
[w] [tom. iv. col. 98.]
[x] [Harduin. concil., tom. v. col. 121.]
[y] [tom. ii. p. 624.]

the church of Rome are condemned of error. The council of Antioch[z], A.D. 345, in which S. Athanasius was condemned: the council of Milan, A.D. 354, of above three hundred bishops: the council of Ariminum, consisting of six hundred bishops: the second council of Ephesus, A.D. 449, in which the Eutychian heresy was confirmed, and the patriarch Flavianus killed by the faction of Dioscorus: the council of Constantinople under Leo Isaurus, A.D. 730: and another at Constantinople thirty-five years after: and lastly the council of Pisa, a hundred and thirty-four years since[a]. Now that these general councils are condemned is a sufficient argument that councils may err: and it is no answer to say they were not confirmed by the pope; for the pope's confirmation I have shewn not to be necessary; or if it were, yet even that also is an argument that general councils may become invalid, either by their own fault, or by some extrinsical supervening accident, either of which evacuates their authority; and whether all that is required to the legitimation of a council was actually observed in any council, is so hard to determine, that no man can be infallibly sure that such a council is authentic and sufficient probation.

6. And that is the second thing I shall observe; there are so many questions concerning the efficient, the form, the matter of general councils, and their manner of proceeding, and their final sanction, that after a question is determined by a conciliary assembly, there are perhaps twenty more questions to be disputed before we can with confidence either believe the council upon its mere authority, or obtrude it upon others. And upon this ground how easy it is to elude the pressure of an argument drawn from the authority of a general council, is very remarkable in the question about the pope's or the council's superiority: which question although it be defined for the council against the pope by five general councils, the council of Florence, of Constance, of Basil, of Pisa, and one of the Laterans; yet the Jesuits to this day account this question *pro non definita*, and have rare pretences for their escape. As first, it is true a council is above a pope in case there be no pope, or he uncertain: which is Bellarmine's[b] answer, never considering whether he spake sense or no, nor yet remembering that the council of Basil deposed Eugenius, who was a true pope, and so acknowledged.—Secondly, sometimes the pope did not confirm these councils, that's their answer. And although it was an exception that the fathers never thought of when they were pressed with the authority of the council of Ariminum, or Sirmium, or any other Arian convention: yet the council of Basil was convened by pope Martin V.; then in its sixteenth session declared

[z] Vid. Socr., lib. ii. cap. 5. [al. 10. p. 86.] et Sozom., lib. iii. cap. 5. [p. 97.]

[a] Gregor. in Regist., lib. iii. caus. 7. [al. lib. iv. ep. 7. tom. ii. col. 686.] ait concilium Numidiæ errasse.—Concilium Aquisgrani erravit, De raptore et rapta, dist. xx. can. 'De libellis.' in glossa. [Gratian. Decret. col. 95.]

[b] [De concil. auctor., lib. ii. cap. 19. tom. ii. col. 130.]

by Eugenius IV. to be lawfully continued, and confirmed expressly in some of its decrees by pope Nicholas, and so stood till it was at last rejected by Leo X. very many years after; but that came too late, and with too visible an interest: and this council did decree *fide catholica tenendum concilium esse supra papam.* But if one pope confirms it and other rejects it, as it happened in this case and in many more, does it not destroy the competency of the authority? And we see it by this instance, that it so serves the turns of men, that it is good in some cases, that is, when it makes for them, and invalid when it makes against them.—Thirdly, but it is a little more ridiculous in the case of the council of Constance, whose decrees were confirmed by Martin V. But that this may be no argument against them, Bellarmine[c] tells you he only confirmed those things *quæ facta fuerant conciliariter, . . re diligenter examinata:* of which there being no mark nor any certain rule to judge it, it is a device that may evacuate any thing we have a mind to, it was not done *conciliariter,* that is, not according to our mind; for *conciliariter* is a fine new nothing, that may signify what you please.—Fourthly, but other devices yet more pretty they have; as, whether the council of Lateran was a general council or no, they know not (no, nor will not know) which is a wise and plain reservation of their own advantages, to make it general or not general as shall serve their turns.—Fifthly, as for the council of Florence, they are not sure whether it hath defined the question *satis aperte; aperte* they will grant, if you will allow them not *satis aperte.*—Sixthly and lastly, the council of Pisa is *neque approbatum neque reprobatum*[d]: which is the greatest folly of all, and most prodigious vanity. So that by something or other, either they were not convened lawfully, or they did not proceed *conciliariter,* or it is not certain that the council was general or no, or whether the council were *approbatum* or *reprobatum,* or else it is *partim confirmatum, partim reprobatum,* or else it is *neque approbatum neque reprobatum;* by one of these ways or a device like to these, all councils and all decrees shall be made to signify nothing, and to have no authority.

7. Thirdly, there is no general council that hath determined that a general council is infallible; no scripture hath recorded it, no tradition universal hath transmitted to us any such proposition: so that we must receive the authority at a lower rate and upon a less probability than the things consigned by that authority. And it is strange that the decrees of councils should be esteemed authentic and infallible, and yet it is not infallibly certain that the councils themselves are infallible, because the belief of the councils' infallibility is not proved to us by any medium but such as may deceive us.

8. Fourthly, but the best instance that councils are some, and may all be, deceived, is the contradiction of one council to another: for in that case both cannot be true, and which of them is true must

[c] [Ut in not. præced.] [d] Bellarm. de conc., lib. i. cap. 8. [tom. ii. col. 16.]

belong to another judgment which is less than the solennity of a general council; and the determination of this matter can be of no greater certainty after it is concluded than when it was propounded as a question, being it is to be determined by the same authority or by a less than itself. But for this allegation we cannot want instances. The council of Trent[e] allows picturing of God the Father; the council of Nice[f] altogether disallows it. The same Nicene council, which was the seventh general, allows of picturing Christ in the form of a lamb; but the sixth synod[g] by no means will endure it, as Caranza[h] affirms. The council of Neocæsarea[i] confirmed by Leo IV. *dist.* xx. *de libellis*[j], and approved in the first Nicene council as it is said in the seventh session of the council of Florence, forbids second marriages, and imposes penances on them that are married the second time, forbidding priests to be present at such marriage-feasts; besides that this is expressly against the doctrine of S. Paul, it is also against the doctrine of the council of Laodicea, which took off such penances, and pronounced second marriages to be free and lawful. Nothing is more discrepant than the third council of Carthage[k], and the council of Laodicea[l], about assignation of the canon of scripture; and yet the sixth general synod[m] approves both: and I would fain know if all general councils are of the same mind with the fathers of the council of Carthage, who reckon into the canon five books of Solomon; I am sure S. Austin[n] reckoned but three, and I think all christendom beside are of the same opinion. And if we look into the title of the law *De conciliis* called *Concordantia discordantiarum*[o], we shall find instances enough to confirm that the decrees of some councils are contradictory to others, and that no wit can reconcile them. And whether they did or no, that they might disagree, and former councils be corrected by later, was the belief of the doctors in those ages in which the best and most famous councils were convened; as appears in that famous saying of S. Austin[p]: speaking concerning the rebaptizing of heretics, and how much the Africans were deceived in that question, he answers the allegation of the bishops' letters and those national councils which confirmed S. Cyprian's opinion, by saying that they were no final determination; for *episcoporum literæ emendari possunt a conciliis nationalibus, concilia nationalia a plenariis, ipsaque plenaria priora a posterioribus emendari.* Not only the occasion of the question, being a matter not of fact but of faith, as being instanced in the question of rebaptization, but also the very fabric and economy of the words,

[e] Sess. xxv. [?]
[f] Act. ii. [tom. iv. col. 88 sqq.—vid. etiam actt. i. et iv. coll. 6 et 240 sqq.]
[g] Can. 82. [tom. iii. col. 1689.]
[h] [Summ. concil., p. 651. 8vo. Rothom. 1641.]
[i] [can. vii. tom. i. col. 283.]
[j] [vid. p. 452. not. a, supra.]
[k] [can. 47. tom. i. col. 968.]
[l] [can. 60. tom. i. col. 791.]
[m] [can. 2. tom. iii. col. 1660.]
[n] De civ. Dei, lib. xvii. cap. 20. [tom. vii. col. 483.]
[o] [Decretum Gratiani, sive Concordia discordantiarum canonum.]
[p] De bapt. Donat., lib. ii. cap. 3. [tom. ix. col. 98.]

put by all the answers of all[q] those men who think themselves pressed with the authority of S. Austin; for "as national councils may correct the bishop's letters, and general councils may correct national, so the later general may correct the former," that is, have contrary and better decrees of manners, and better determinations in matters of faith. And from hence hath risen a question, whether is to be received, the former or the later councils, in case they contradict each other? The former are nearer the fountains apostolical, the later are of greater consideration: the first have more authority, the later more reason: the first are more venerable, the later more inquisitive and seeing. And now what rule shall we have to determine our beliefs whether to authority or reason, the reason and the authority both of them not being the highest in their kind, both of them being repudiable, and at most but probable? And here it is that this great uncertainty is such as not to determine any body, but fit to serve every body: and it is sport to see that Bellarmine[r] will by all means have the council of Carthage preferred before the council of Laodicea, because it is later; and yet he prefers the second Nicene council[s] before the council of Frankfort, because it is elder. S. Austin would have the former generals to be mended by the later; but Isidore in Gratian[t] says, when councils do differ, *standum esse antiquioribus*, 'the elder must carry it.' And indeed these probables are buskins[u] to serve every foot, and they are like *magnum et parvum*, they have nothing of their own, all that they have is in comparison of others: so these topics have nothing of resolute and dogmatical truth, but in relation to such ends as an interessed person hath a mind to serve upon them.

9. Fifthly, there are many councils corrupted, and many pretended and alleged when there were no such things; both which make the topic of the authority of councils to be little and inconsiderable. There is a council brought to light in the edition of Councils by Binius, viz., Sinuessanum, pretended to be kept in the year three hundred and three, but it was so private till then that we find no mention of it in any ancient record: neither Eusebius, nor Ruffinus, S. Hierome, nor Socrates, Sozomen, nor Theodoret, nor Eutropius, nor Bede, knew any thing of it; and the eldest allegation of it is by pope Nicholas I. in the ninth century. And he that shall consider, that three hundred bishops in the midst of horrid persecutions (for so then they were) are pretended to have convened, will need no greater argument to suspect the imposture. Besides, he that was the framer of the engine did not lay his ends together handsomely: for it is said that the deposition of Marcellinus by the synod was told to Diocletian when he was in the Persian war; when as it is known be-

[q] ['all' om. A.]

[r] Lib. ii. de conc. c. 8. § 'Respondeo in primis.' [tom. ii. col. 88 A.]

[s] Ibid. § 'De concilio autem.' [col. 91 B.]

[t] Dist. xx. [leg. xl.] c. [28.] 'Domino sancto.' [col. 271.]

[u] [vid. Stephan. lex. in voc. κόθορνος.]

fore that time he had returned to Rome and triumphed for his Persian conquest, as Eusebius in his Chronicle reports: and this is so plain that Binius and Baronius pretend the text to be corrupted, and to go to mend it by such an emendation[v] as is a plain contradiction to the sense, and that so unclerklike, viz. by putting in two words and leaving out one, which whether it may be allowed them by any license less than poetical let critics judge. S. Gregory[x] saith that the Constantinopolitans had corrupted the synod of Chalcedon, and that he suspected the same concerning the Ephesine council. And in the fifth synod there was a notorious prevarication, for there were false epistles of pope Vigilius and Menna the patriarch of Constantinople inserted, and so they passed for authentic till they were discovered in the sixth[y] general synod, actions twelve and fourteen. And not only false decrees and actions may creep into the codes of councils, but sometimes the authority of a learned man may abuse the church with pretended decrees of which there is no copy or shadow in the code itself. And thus Thomas Aquinas[z] says that the epistle to the Hebrews was reckoned in the canon by the Nicene council, no shadow of which appears in those copies we now have of it: and this pretence and the reputation of the man prevailed so far with Melchior Canus[a] the learned bishop of Canaries[b], that he believed it upon this ground, *Vir sanctus rem adeo gravem non astrueret nisi compertum habuisset:* and there are many things which have prevailed upon less reason and a more slight authority. And that very council of Nice hath not only been pretended by Aquinas, but very much abused by others, and its authority and great reputation hath made it more liable to the fraud and pretences of idle people. For whereas the Nicene fathers made but twenty canons (for so many and no more were received by Cecilian of Carthage[c], that was at Nice in the council; by Austin[d], and two hundred African bishops with him; by S. Cyril of Alexandria[e], by Atticus of Constantinople, by Ruffinus[f], Isidore[g], and Theodoret[h], as Baronius[i] witnesses) yet there are fourscore lately found out in an Arabian MS. and published in Latin by Turrian[k] and Alfonsus of Pisa, Jesuits surely, and like to be masters of the mint. And not only the canons

[v] Pro 'cum esset in bello Persarum,' legi volunt 'cum reversus esset e bello Persarum.' Euseb. Chron. [in Olymp. cclxx. p. 224.] vide Binium in notis ad concil. Sinuessanum, tom. i. concil. [p. 185.] et Baron. annal., tom. iii. A.D. 303. num. 107. [al. tom. ii. p. 774.]

[x] Lib. v. [al. vi.] ep. 14, ad Narsem. [tom. ii. col. 803.]

[y] [tom. iii. col. 1311, 58 sqq.]

[z] Comment. in Hebr. ['Ante synodum Nicænam quidam dubitaverunt an ista epistola esset Pauli.' In Prolog.]

[a] [Loc. theol., lib. ii. cap. 9. p. 55. opp. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1605.]

[b] ['of the Canaries,' C.]

[c] Concil. Carthag. vi. cap. 9. [tom. i. col. 1244.]

[d] Concil. Afric. [Bin., tom. i. p. 743 sqq.—Harduin., tom. i. col. 940.]

[e] Ibid. c. 102 et 103. [Bin., tom. i. p. 756 sq.—Harduin., tom. i. col. 945.]

[f] Hist. eccl., lib. i. cap. 6. [p. 211.]

[g] In princ. con. de Synod. princ. [Bin., tom. i. p. 327.]

[h] [Hist. eccl., lib. i. cap. 8, in fin.]

[i] Tom. iii. A.D. 325. num. 156. [p. 323.]

[k] [Harduin. concil., tom. i. col. 463 sqq.]

but the very acts of the Nicene council are false and spurious, and are so confessed by Baronius[l]; though how he and Lindanus[m] will be reconciled upon the point, I neither know well nor much care. Now if one council be corrupted, we see by the instance of S. Gregory that another may be suspected, and so all; because he found the council of Chalcedon corrupted, he suspected also the Ephesine; and another might have suspected more, for the Nicene was tampered foully with, and so three of the four generals were sullied and made suspicious, and therefore we could not be secure of any. If false acts be inserted in one council, who can trust the actions of any, unless he had the keeping the records himself, or durst swear for the register? And if a very learned man, as Thomas Aquinas was, did either wilfully deceive us or was himself ignorantly abused in allegation of a canon which was not, it is but a very fallible topic at the best, and the most holy man that is may be abused himself, and the wisest may deceive others.

10. Sixthly and lastly, to all this and to the former instances by way of corollary I add some more particulars in which it is notorious that councils general and national, that is, such as were either general by original or by adoption into the canon of the catholic church, did err and were actually deceived. The first council of Toledo[n] admits to the communion him that hath a concubine, so he have no wife besides: and this council is approved by pope Leo in the ninety-second epistle to Rusticus bishop of Narbona. Gratian[o] says that the council means by a concubine, a wife married *sine dote et solennitate;* but this is daubing with untempered mortar. For though it was a custom amongst the Jews to distinguish wives from their concubines by dowry and legal solennities, yet the Christian distinguished them no otherwise than as lawful and unlawful, than as chastity and fornication. And besides, if by a concubine is meant a lawful wife without a dowry, to what purpose should the council make a law that such a one might be admitted to the communion? For I suppose it was never thought to be a law of christianity that a man should have a portion with his wife, nor he that married a poor virgin should deserve to be excommunicate. So that Gratian and his followers are pressed so with this canon, that to avoid the impiety of it they expound it to a signification without sense or purpose. But the business then was, that adultery was so public and notorious a practice that the council did choose rather to endure simple fornication, that by such permission of a less they might slacken the public custom of a greater; just as at Rome they permit stews to prevent unnatural sins. But that by a public sanction fornicators, habitually and notoriously such, should be admitted to the holy communion, was an act of priests, so unfit for priests, that no

[l] Tom. iii. ad A.D. 325. n. 62, 63. [p. 294 sq.]
[m] Panopl., lib. ii. c. 6. [p. 56.]
[n] [can. xvii. tom. i. col. 992.]
[o] Dist. xxxiv. can. [4.] 'Omnibus.' [col. 183.]

the sum of religion did not consist in maintaining the *grandezza* of the papacy; where there was no order of men with a fourth vow[d] upon them to advance S. Peter's chair; when there was no man, nor any company of men, that esteemed themselves infallible: and therefore they searched for truth as if they meant to find it, and would believe it if they could see it proved, not resolved to prove it because they had upon chance or interest believed it; then they had rather have spoken a truth, than upheld their reputation, but only in order to truth[e]. This was done sometimes, and when it was done, God's spirit never failed them, but gave them such assistances as were sufficient to that good end for which they were assembled and did implore His aid. And therefore it is that the four general councils, so called by way of eminency, have gained so great a reputation above all others; not because they had a better promise or more special assistances, but because they proceeded better according to the rule, with less faction, without ambition and temporal ends.

12. And yet those very assemblies of bishops had no authority by their decrees to make a divine faith, or to constitute new objects of necessary credence; they made nothing true that was not so before, and therefore they are to be apprehended in the nature of excellent guides, and whose decrees are most certainly to determine all those who have no argument to the contrary of greater force and efficacy than the authority or reasons of the council. And there is a duty owing to every parish priest, and to every diocesan bishop; these are appointed over us, and to answer for our souls, and are therefore morally to guide us as reasonable creatures are to be guided, that is, by reason and discourse: for in things of judgment and understanding, they are but in form next above beasts that are to be ruled by the imperiousness and absoluteness of authority, unless the authority be divine, that is, infallible. Now then in a juster height, but still in its true proportion, assemblies of bishops are to guide us with a higher authority, because in reason it is supposed they will do it better, with more argument and certainty, and with decrees which have the advantage by being the results of many discourses of very wise and good men. But that the authority of general councils was never esteemed absolute, infallible, and unlimited, appears in this, that before they were obliging, it was necessary that each particular church respectively should accept them, *Concurrente universali totius ecclesiæ consensu, &c., in declaratione veritatum quæ credendæ sunt*[f], *&c.* That's the way of making the decrees of councils become authentic, and

[d] [Professa itidem societas [sc. Jesuitarum] præter tria vota dicta [sc. obedientiæ, paupertatis, et castitatis] votum facit expressum summo pontifici, ut vicario.. Christi,.. nimirum ad proficiscendum sine excusatione, non petito viatico, quocunque gentium ejus Sanctitas jusserit, inter fideles vel infideles, ad res quæ ad divinum cultum et religionis christianæ bonum spectant.—Constit. societ. Jesu, exam. gen. cap. i. p. 5. 8vo. Rom. 1583.]

[e] [sic edd.]

[f] Vid. S. August. de Bapt. contra Donat., lib. i. c. 18. [tom. ix. col. 93.]

be turned into a law, as Gerson observes; and till they did, their decrees were but a dead letter: and therefore it is that these later popes have so laboured that the council of Trent should be received in France; and Carolus Molineus[g], a great lawyer, and of the Roman communion, disputed[h] against the reception. And this is a known condition in the canon law; but it proves plainly that the decrees of councils have their authority from the voluntary submission of the particular churches, not from the prime sanction and constitution of the council. And there is great reason it should: for as the representative body of the church derives all power from the diffusive body which is represented, so it resolves into it; and though it may have all the legal power, yet it hath not all the natural; for more able men may be unsent than sent, and they who are sent may be wrought upon by stratagem, which cannot happen to the whole diffusive church. It is therefore most fit that since the legal power, that is, the external, was passed over to the body representative, yet the efficacy of it and the internal should so still remain in the diffusive as to have power to consider whether their representatives did their duty yea or no, and so to proceed accordingly. For unless it be in matters of justice in which the interest of a third person is concerned, no man will or can be supposed to pass away all power from himself of doing himself right, in matters personal, proper, and of so high concernment: it is most unnatural and unreasonable. But besides that they are excellent instruments of peace, the best human judicatories in the world, rare sermons for the determining a point in controversy, and the greatest probability from human authority; besides these advantages I say, I know nothing greater that general councils can pretend to with reason and argument sufficient to satisfy any wise man. And as there was never any council so general but it might have been more general, for in respect of the whole church even Nice itself was but a small assembly; so there is no decree so well constituted but it may be proved by an argument higher than the authority of the council: and therefore general councils, and national, and provincial, and diocesan, in their several degrees, are excellent guides for the prophets, and directions and instructions for their prophesyings; but not of weight and authority to restrain their liberty so wholly, but that they may dissent when they see a reason strong enough so to persuade them, as to be willing upon the confidence of that reason and their own sincerity to answer to God for such their modesty, and peaceable but (as they believe) their necessary disagreeing.

[g] [In reg. cancell. xviii. § 359. tom. ii. col. 1905. opp. fol. Par. 1612.]

[h] So did the third estate of France in the convention of the three estates under Louis XIII. earnestly contend against it. [Gramond. Hist. Gall., lib. i. p. 69. 8vo. Amst. 1653.]

§ 7. Of the fallibility of the pope, and the uncertainty of his expounding scripture, and resolving questions.

1. But since the question between the council a the pope grew high, there have not wanted abetto so confident on the pope's behalf as to believe gene councils to be nothing but pomps and solennities the catholic church, and that all the authority determining controversies is formally and effectual in the pope. And therefore to appeal from the po to a future council is a heresy, yea and treason too, said pope Pius I and therefore it concerns us now to be wise and wary. But before proceed, I must needs remember that pope Pius II. while he was t wise and learned Æneas Sylvius[1], was very confident for the pr eminence of a council, and gave a merry reason why more clerks we for the popes than the council, though the truth was on the oth side, even because the pope gives bishoprics and abbeys, but counci give none: and yet as soon as he was made pope, as if he had be inspired, his eyes were open to see the great privileges of S. Pete chair, which before he could not see, being amused with the truth, else with the reputation of a general council. But however, there a many that hope to make it good that the pope is the universal and t infallible doctor, that he breathes decrees as oracles, that to disse from any of his cathedral determinations is absolute heresy, the ru of faith being nothing else but conformity to the chair of Peter. S that here we have met a restraint of prophecy indeed; but yet make amends I hope we shall have an infallible guide; and when man is in heaven, he will never complain that his choice is take from him, and that he is confined to love and to admire, since h love and his admiration is fixed upon that which makes him happ even upon God himself. And in the church of Rome there is in lower degree, but in a true proportion, as little cause to be trouble that we are confined to believe just so, and no choice left us for o understandings to discover or our wills to choose, because though w be limited, yet we are pointed out where we ought to rest, we a confined to our centre, and there where our understandings will b satisfied and therefore will be quiet, and where after all our striving studies, and endeavours, we desire to come, that is, to truth; f there we are secured to find it because we have a guide that is infa lible. If this prove true, we are well enough; but if it be false uncertain, it were better we had still kept our liberty than be cozene out of it with gay pretences. This then we must consider.

2. And here we shall be oppressed with a cloud of witnesses: f what more plain than the commission given to Peter? "Thou a Peter, and upon this rock will I build My church;" and, "To th will I give the keys:" and again, "For thee have I prayed that t faith fail not; but thou when thou art converted confirm thy brethren.

[1] Epist. ad Norimberg. [ep. cccc. p. 932.]—Patrum et avorum nostrorum tempore pauci audebant dicere papam esse supra concilium, l. i. de gestis Co cil. Basil.

And again, "If thou lovest Me, feed My sheep." Now nothing of this being spoken to any of the other apostles, by one of these places S. Peter must needs be appointed foundation or head of the church, and by consequence he is to rule and govern all. By some other of these places he is made the supreme pastor, and he is to teach and determine all, and enabled with an infallible power so to do. And in a right understanding of these authorities, the fathers speak great things of the chair of Peter; for we are as much bound to believe that all this was spoken to Peter's successors as to his person: that must by all means be supposed, and so did the old doctors, who had as much certainty of it as we have, and no more: but yet let's hear what they have said. "To this church by reason of its more powerful principality it is necessary all churches round about should convene[k]." "In this, tradition apostolical always was observed, and therefore to communicate with this bishop, with this church, was to be in communion with the church catholic[l]." "To this church error or perfidiousness cannot have access[m]." "Against this see the gates of hell cannot prevail[n]." "For we know this church to be built upon a rock;.. and whoever eats the lamb not within this house, is profane; he that is not in the ark of Noah perishes in the inundation of waters;.. he that gathers not with this bishop, he scatters; and he that belongeth not to Christ must needs belong to antichrist[o]." And that's his final sentence. But if you would have all this proved by an infallible argument, Optatus[p] of Milevis in Africa supplies it to us from the very name of Peter: for therefore Christ gave him the cognomination of Cephas ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, to shew that S. Peter was the visible 'head' of the catholic church. *Dignum patella operculum!* This long harangue must needs be full of tragedy to all them that take liberty to themselves to follow scripture and their best guides, if it happens in that liberty that they depart from the persuasions of the communion of Rome. But indeed, if with the peace of the bishops of Rome I may say it, this scene is the most unhandsomely laid, and the worst carried, of any of those pretences that have lately abused christendom.

3. First, against the allegations of scripture I shall lay no greater prejudice than this, that if a person disinterested should see them, and consider what the products of them might possibly be, the last thing that he would think of would be how that any of these places should serve the ends or pretences of the church of Rome. For

[k] Irenæ. contra hæres., l. iii. c. 3. [§ 2. p. 175.]

[l] Ambros. de obitu Satyri, [§ 47. tom. ii. col. 1127 A.] et l. i. ep. 4. [al. ep. 11.] ad Impp. [§ 4. tom. ii. col. 811 C.]

[m] Cypr. ep. lv. [al. lix.] ad Cornel. [p. 136.]

[n] S. Austin. in psalm. contra partem Donat. [tom. ix. col. 7.]

[o] Hieron. ep. lvii. [al. xiv.] ad Damasum, [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 19 sq.]

[p] Lib. ii. cont. Parmen. [cap. 2. p. 31. —'Apostolorum caput Petrus; unde et Cephas appellatus est.'—'Videtur Optatus id sibi velle, Petrum esse dictum Cepham a κεφαλῇ, quod caput significat, quæ allusio parum solida est.' Du Pin.]

to instance in one of the particulars, that man had need have a strong fancy who imagines that because Christ prayed for S. Peter that (being He had designed him to be one of those upon whose preaching and doctrine He did mean to constitute a church) that 'his faith might not fail' (for it was necessary that no bitterness or stopping should be in one of the first springs, lest the current be either spoiled or obstructed) that therefore the faith of pope Alexander VI., or Gregory, or Clement, fifteen hundred years after, should be preserved by virtue of that prayer, which the form of words, the time, the occasion, the manner of the address, the effect itself, and all the circumstances of the action and person, did determine to be personal. And when it was more than personal, S. Peter did not represent his successors at Rome, but the whole catholic church, says Aquinas[q] and the divines of the university of Paris; *volunt enim pro sola ecclesia esse oratum*, says Bellarmine[r] of them: and the gloss upon the canon law[s] plainly denies the effect of this prayer at all to appertain to the pope; *Quæro de qua ecclesia intelligas quod hic dicitur quod non possit errare: si de ipso papa qui ecclesia dicitur, &c.—Sed certum est quod papa errare potest*[t]*; Respondeo, ipsa congregatio fidelium hic dicitur ecclesia, et talis ecclesia non potest non esse; nam ipse Dominus orat pro ecclesia, et voluntate labiorum suorum non fraudubitur.* But there is a little danger in this argument when we well consider it; but it is likely to redound on the head of them whose turns it should serve. For it may be remembered that for all this prayer of Christ for S. Peter, the good man fell foully, and denied his Master shamefully: and shall Christ's prayer be of greater efficacy for his successors for whom it was made but indirectly and by consequence, than for himself for whom it was directly and in the first intention? And if not, then for all this argument the popes may deny Christ as well as their chief and decessor Peter. But it would not be forgotten how the Roman doctors will by no means allow that S. Peter was then the chief bishop or pope, when he denied his master: but then much less was he chosen chief bishop when the prayer was made for him, because the prayer was made before his fall, that is, before that time in which it is confessed he was not as yet made pope; and how then the whole succession of the papacy should be entitled to it, passes the length of my hand to span. But then also if it be supposed and allowed that these words shall entail infallibility upon the chair of Rome, why shall not also all the apostolical sees be infallible as well as Rome? why shall not Constantinople or Byzanti where S. Andrew sat[u]? why shall not Ephesus where S. John sat, or Jerusalem where S. James sat? for Christ prayed for them all *ut Pater sanctificaret eos sua veritate*, John xvii.

[q] 2 2ᵃᵉ. q. ii. art. 6. [ad 3ᵐ.]
[r] De Rom. pontif., lib. iv. c. 3. § 1. [tom. i. col. 962.]
[s] [Gratian. Decret.] caus. xxi. [leg. xxiv.] cap. [9.] 'A recta.' [col. 1511.]
[t] xxix. dist. 'Anastasius.'—lx. dist. 'Si papa.' [leg. xix. dist. c. 9. et xl. dist. c. 6. ubi supra, col. 93 et 211.]
[u] [vid. Niceph. Hist. eccl., ii. 39.]

4. Secondly, for *tibi dabo claves*, was it personal or not? If it were, then the bishops of Rome have nothing to do with it: if it were not, then by what argument will it be made evident that S. Peter in the promise represented only his successors, and not the whole college of apostles, and the whole hierarchy? For if S. Peter was chief of the apostles and head of the church, he might fair enough be the representative of the whole college, and receive it in their right as well as his own: which also is certain that it was so; for the same promise of binding and loosing (which certainly was all that the keys were given for) was made afterward to all the apostles, Matth. xviii., and the power of remitting and retaining, which in reason and according to the style of the church is the same thing in other words, was actually given to all the apostles: and unless that was the performing the first and second promise, we find it not recorded in scripture how or when, or whether yet or no, the promise be performed; that promise I say which did not pertain to Peter principally and by origination, and to the rest by communication, society, and adherence, but that promise which was made to Peter first, but not for himself, but for all the college, and for all their successors; and then made the second time to them all, without representation, but in diffusion, and performed to all alike in presence, except S. Thomas. And if he went to S. Peter to derive it from him, I know not; I find no record for that; but that Christ conveyed the promise to him by the same commission, the church yet never doubted, nor had she any reason. But this matter is too notorious; I say no more to it, but repeat the words and arguments of S. Austin[v], *Si hoc Petro tantum dictum est, non facit hoc ecclesia*, If the keys were only given and so promised to S. Peter that the church hath not the keys, then the church can neither bind nor loose, remit nor retain; which God forbid. If any man should endeavour to answer this argument, I leave him and S. Austin to contest it.

5. Thirdly, for *pasce oves*, there is little in that allegation besides the boldness of the objectors: for were not all the apostles bound to feed Christ's sheep? had they not all the commission from Christ and Christ's spirit immediately? S. Paul had certainly. Did not S. Peter himself say to all the bishops of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, that they should 'feed the flock of God,' and 'the great Bishop and Shepherd should give them an immarcescible crown?' plainly implying that from whence they derived their authority, from Him they were sure of a reward: in pursuance of which S. Cyprian[x] laid his argument upon this basis, *Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, &c. et singulis pastoribus portio gregis, &c.* Did not S. Paul call to the bishops of Ephesus to 'feed the flock of God of which the Holy Ghost hath made them bishops or overseers?' And that this very commission was spoken to S. Peter[y] not in a personal

[v] Tra. l. in Joann. [§ 12. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 633.]
[x] Lib. i. ep. 3. [al. ep. lix. p. 136.]
[y] ['to Peter' A.]

but a public capacity, and in him spoke to all the apostles, we see attested by S. Austin[z] and S. Ambrose and generally by all antiquity; and it so concerned even every priest that Damasus[a] was willing enough to have S. Hierome explicate many questions for him. And Liberius[b] writes an epistle to Athanasius, with much modesty requiring his advice in a question of faith, ἵνα κἀγὼ πεποιθὼς ὦ ἀδιακρίτως περὶ ὧν ἀξιοῖς κελεύειν μοι, 'that I also may be persuaded without all doubting of those things which you shall be pleased to command me.' Now Liberius needed not to have troubled himself to have writ into the east to Athanasius, for if he had but seated himself in his chair and made the dictate, the result of his pen and ink would certainly have taught him and all the church; but that the good pope was ignorant that either *pasce oves* was his own charter and prerogative, or that any other words of scripture had made him to be infallible; or if he was not ignorant of it, he did very ill to compliment himself out of it. So did all those bishops of Rome that in that troublesome and unprofitable question of Easter, being unsatisfied in the supputation of the Egyptians and the definitions of the mathematical bishops of Alexandria, did yet require and entreat S. Ambrose[c] to tell them his opinion, as he himself witnesses, if *pasce oves* belongs only to the pope by primary title, in these cases the sheep came to feed the shepherd, which, though it was well enough in the thing, is very ill for the pretensions of the Roman bishops. And if we consider how little many of the popes have done towards feeding the sheep of Christ, we shall hardly determine which is the greater prevarication, that the pope should claim the whole commission to be granted to him, or that the execution of the commission should be wholly passed over to others. And it may be there is a mystery in it, that since S. Peter sent a bishop with his staff to raise up a disciple of his from the dead, who was afterward bishop of Triers, the popes of Rome never wear a pastoral staff except it be in that diocese, says Aquinas[d]; for great reason that he who does not do the office should not bear the symbol. But a man would think that the pope's master of the ceremonies was ill advised not to assign a pastoral staff to him, who pretends the commission of *pasce oves* to belong to him by prime right and origination: but this is not a business to be merry in.

6. But the great support is expected from *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam, &c.* Now there being so great difference in the exposition of these words, by persons disinteressed, who, if any, might be allowed to judge in this question, it is certain that neither one sense nor other can be obtruded for an article of faith, much less as a *catholicon* instead of all, by constituting an

[z] De agone christ. c. 30. [tom. vi. col. 260.]

[a] [opp. S. Hieron., tom. ii. p. 561 sqq.]

[b] Epist. ad Athanas. apud Athanas., tom. i. p. 42. Paris. [Ben., tom. ii. p. 664.]

[c] Lib. i. epist. 83. [leg. 23. tom. ii. col. 880 sqq.]

[d] In iv. sent. dist. 24. [q. 3. art. 3 fin.]

authority which should guide us in all faith and determine us in all questions. For if the church was not built upon the person of Peter, then his successors can challenge nothing from this instance: now that it was the confession of Peter upon which the church was to rely for ever, we have witnesses very credible, S. Ignatius[e], S. Basil[f], S. Hilary[g], S. Gregory Nyssen[h], S. Gregory the great[i], S. Austin[k], S. Cyril of Alexandria[l], Isidore Pelusiot[m], and very many more. And although all these witnesses concurring cannot make a proposition to be true, yet they are sufficient witnesses that it was not the universal belief of christendom that the church was built upon S. Peter's person. Cardinal Perron hath a fine fancy to elude this variety of exposition, and the consequents of it; for saith he, 'these expositions are not contrary or exclusive of each other, but inclusive and consequent to each other: for the church is founded causally upon the confession of S. Peter, formally upon the ministry of his person, and this was a reward or a consequent of the former: so that these expositions are both true, but they are conjoined as mediate and immediate, direct and collateral, literal and moral, original and perpetual, accessory and temporal, the one consigned at the beginning, the other introduced upon occasion. For before the spring of the Arian heresy the fathers expounded these words of the person of Peter; but after the Arians troubled them, the fathers finding great authority and energy in this confession of Peter for the establishment of the natural filiation of the Son of God, to advance the reputation of these words and the force of the argument, gave themselves license to expound these words to the present advantage, and to make the confession of Peter to be the foundation of the church, that if the Arians should encounter this authority, they might with more prejudice to their persons declaim against their cause by saying they overthrew the foundation of the church. Besides that this answer does much dishonour the reputation of the fathers' integrity, and makes their interpretations less credible, as being made not of knowledge or reason but of necessity and to serve a present turn, it is also false: for Ignatius[n] expounds it in a spiritual sense, which also the liturgy attributed to S. James calls ἐπὶ πέτραν τῆς πίστεως· and Origen[o] expounds it mystically to a third purpose, but exclusively to this: and all these were before the Arian controversy. But if it be lawful to make such unproved observations, it would have been to better purpose and more reason to have observed it thus,—The fathers so long as the bishop of Rome

[e] Ad Philadelph. [§ ix. p. 81.]
[f] Seleuc. [sc. S. Basil. Seleuciæ episcopus,] orat. xxv. [in fin.—Una cum opp. S. Gregor. Thaumat., &c. fol. Par. 1621. p. 142 b.]
[g] Lib. vi. de Trinit. [§ 36. col. 903 E.]
[h] De Trinit. adv. Judæos. [ad fin., tom. ii. p. 162.]
[i] Lib. iii. ep. 33. [al. iv. 38. tom. ii. col. 718.]
[k] In 1 ep. Joann. tr. x. [§ 1. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 894.]
[l] De Trinit., lib. iv. [tom. v. p. 507 E.]
[m] Lib. i. ep. 235. [p. 67.]
[n] Epist. ad Philadelph. [not. e, supra.]
[o] In c. xvi. Matt. tract. 1. [tom. iii. p. 525.]

kept himself to the limits prescribed him by Christ and indulged to him by the constitution or concession of the church, were unwary and apt to expound this place of the person of Peter; but when the church began to enlarge her phylacteries by the favour of princes and the sunshine of a prosperous fortune, and the pope by the advantage of the imperial seat and other accidents began to invade upon the other bishops and patriarchs, then that he might have no colour from scripture for such new pretensions, they did most generally turn the stream of their expositions from the person to the confession of Peter, and declared that to be the foundation of the church. And thus I have requited fancy with fancy: but for the main point, that these two expositions are inclusive of each other, I find no warrant. For though they may consist together well enough, if Christ had so intended them; yet unless it could be shewn by some circumstance of the text, or some other extrinsical argument, that they must be so, and that both senses were actually intended, it is but *gratis dictum* and a begging of the question to say that they are so; and the fancy so new, that when S. Austin had expounded this place of the person of Peter, he reviews it again, and in his Retractations leaves every man to his liberty which to take, as having nothing certain in this article: which had been altogether needless if he had believed them to be inclusively in each other; neither of them had need to have been retracted, both were alike true, both of them might have been believed. But I said the fancy was new, and I had reason; for it was so unknown till yesterday that even the late writers of his own side expound the words of the confession of S. Peter exclusively to his person or any thing else, as is to be seen in Marsilius[p], Petrus de Aliaco[q], and the gloss upon *Dist.* xix. *can.* '*Ita Dominus*,' § '*Ut supra*[r].' Which also was the interpretation of Phavorinus Camers[s] their own bishop, from whom they learnt the resemblance of the words Πέτρος and *πέτρα*, of which they have made so many gay discourses. Πέτρα στερεά ἐστι πίστις ἀῤῥαγὴς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ θεμελίῳ προθεμελιουμένη.

7. Fifthly, but upon condition I may have leave at another time to recede from so great and numerous testimony of fathers, I am willing to believe that it was not the confession of S. Peter but his person upon which Christ said He would build His church, or that these expositions are consistent with and consequent to each other; that this confession was the objective foundation of faith, and Christ and His apostles the subjective; Christ principally and S. Peter instrumentally: and yet I understand not any advantage will hence accrue to the see of Rome. For upon S. Peter it was built, but not alone,

[p] [Sc. Mars. Manardinus.] Defens. pacis, part. ii. c. 28. [p. 399 sqq. 8vo. Francof. 1612.]

[q] Recommend. sacr. script. [in Gratii Fascic. append. p. 508. ed. fol. Lond. 1690.]

[r] [leg. 'Et super;' Gratian. decret., col. 90.]

[s] [Lexic. col. 1496.]

for it was "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone[t];" and when S. Paul[u] reckoned the economy of hierarchy, he reckons not Peter first, and then the apostles; but "first apostles, secondarily prophets," &c. And whatsoever is first, either is before all things else, or at least nothing is before it. So that at least S. Peter is not before all the rest of the apostles; which also S. Paul[x] expressly avers, "I am in nothing inferior to the very chiefest of the apostles," no, not in the very being a rock and a foundation: and it was of the church of Ephesus that S. Paul said in particular it was *columna et firmamentum veritatis*[y]; that church was, not excluding others, for they also were as much as she: for so we keep close and be united to the corner-stone; although some be master-builders, yet all may build; and we have known whole nations converted by laymen and women, who have been builders so far as to bring them to the corner-stone[z].

8. Sixthly, but suppose all these things concern S. Peter in all the capacities can be with any colour pretended, yet what have the bishops of Rome to do with this? For how will it appear that these promises and commissions did relate to him as a particular bishop, and not as a public apostle? since this later is so much the more likely, because the great pretence of all seems in reason more proportionable to the founding of a church, than its continuance. And yet if they did relate to him as a particular bishop (which yet is a further degree of improbability, removed further from certainty) yet why shall S. Clement or Linus rather succeed in this great office of headship that S. John or any of the apostles that survived Peter? It is no way likely a private person should skip over the head of an apostle. Or why shall his successors at Rome more enjoy the benefit of it than his successors at Antioch? since that he was at Antioch and preached there, we have a divine authority; but that he did so at Rome, at most we have but a human. And if it be replied that because he died at Rome, it was argument enough that there his successors were to inherit his privilege, this besides that at most it is but one little degree of probability, and so not of strength sufficient to support an article of faith, it makes that the great divine right of Rome, and the apostolical presidency, was so contingent and fallible as to depend upon the decree of Nero; and if he had sent him to Antioch there to have suffered martyrdom, the bishops of that town had been heads of the catholic church. And this thing presses the harder because it is held by no mean persons in the church of Rome that the bishopric of Rome and the papacy are things separable, and the pope may quit that see and sit in another; which to my understand-

[t] [Eph. ii. 20.]
[u] [1 Cor. xii. 28.]
[x] [2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11.]
[y] [1 Tim. iii. 15, ed. vulg.]
[z] Vid. Socrat., l. i. c. 19, 20. [p. 49 sqq.]—Sozom., l. ii. c. 14. [p. 62.]—Niceph., l. xiv. c. 40. [tom. ii. p. 532.]

ing is an argument that he that succeeded Peter at Antioch, is as much supreme by divine right as he that sits at Rome[a]; both alike, that is, neither by divine ordinance. For if the Roman bishops by Christ's intention were to be head of the church, then by the same intention the succession must be continued in that see; and then let the pope go whither he will, the bishop of Rome must be the head: which they themselves deny, and the pope himself did not believe when in a schism he sat at Avignon. And that it was to be continued in the see of Rome, it is but offered to us upon conjecture, upon an act of providence (as they fancy it) so ordering it by vision; and this proved by an author which themselves call fabulous and apocryphal under the name of Linus (in *Biblioth. PP.*[b]) *De passione Petri et Pauli:* a goodly building, which relies upon an event that was accidental, whose purpose was but insinuated, the meaning of it but conjectured at, and this conjecture so uncertain, that it was an imperfect aim at the purpose of an event, which whether it was true or no was so uncertain that it is ten to one there was no such matter. And yet again, another degree of uncertainty is, to whom the bishops of Rome do succeed: for S. Paul was as much bishop of Rome as S. Peter was; there he presided, there he preached, and he it was that was the doctor of the uncircumcision and of the gentiles, S. Peter of the circumcision and of the Jews only; and therefore the converted Jews at Rome might with better reason claim the privilege of S. Peter than the Romans and the churches in her communion, who do not derive from Jewish parents.

9. Seventhly, if the words were never so appropriate to Peter, or also communicated to his successors, yet of what value will the consequent be? what prerogative is entailed upon the chair of Rome? For that S. Peter was the ministerial head of the church is the most that is desired to be proved by those and all other words brought for the same purposes and interests of that see; now let the ministerial head have what dignity can be imagined, let him be the first (and in all communities that are regular and orderly there must be something that is first, upon certain occasions where an equal power cannot be exercised, and made pompous or ceremonial) but will this ministerial headship infer an infallibility? will it infer more than the headship of the Jewish synagogue, where clearly the high priest was supreme in many senses, yet in no sense infallible; will it infer more to us than it did amongst the apostles, amongst whom if for order's sake S. Peter was the first, yet he had no compulsory power over the apostles? there was no such thing spoke of, nor any such thing put in practice. And that the other apostles were by a personal privilege as infallible as himself, is no reason to hinder the exercise of jurisdiction, or any compulsory power over them; for though in faith they were infallible, yet in manners and matter of fact as likely

[a] Vid. Cameracens. [al. 'Petrum de Alliaco,' vid. not. q, supra.]

[b] [Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. i. p. 71 C.]

to err as S. Peter himself was: and certainly there might have something happened in the whole college that might have been a record of his authority, by transmitting an example of the exercise of some judicial power over some one of them. If he had but withstood any of them to their faces, as S. Paul did him, it had been more than yet is said in his behalf. Will the ministerial headship infer any more than that when the church in a community or a public capacity should do any act of ministry ecclesiastical, he shall be first in order? Suppose this to be a dignity to preside in councils, which yet was not always granted him; suppose it to be a power of taking cognizance of the major causes of bishops when councils cannot be called; suppose it a double voice, or the last decisive, or the negative in the causes exterior: suppose it to be what you will of dignity or external regiment, which, when all churches were united in communion, and neither the interest of states nor the engagement of opinions had made disunion, might better have been acted than now it can: yet this will fall infinitely short of a power to determine controversies infallibly, and to prescribe to all men's faith and consciences. A ministerial headship, or the prime minister, cannot in any capacity become the foundation of the church to any such purpose. And therefore men are causelessly amused with such premises, and are afraid of such conclusions which will never follow from the admission of any sense of these words that can with any probability be pretended.

10. Eightly, I consider that these arguments from scripture are too weak to support such an authority which pretends to give oracles and to answer infallibly in questions of faith, because there is greater reason to believe the popes of Rome have erred, and greater certainty of demonstration, than these places can be that they are infallible; as will appear by the instances and perpetual experiment of their being deceived, of which there is no question; but of the sense of these places there is. And indeed if I had as clear scripture for their infallibility as I have against their half-communion, against their service in an unknown tongue, worshipping of images, and divers other articles, I would make no scruple of believing, but limit and conform my understanding to all their dictates, and believe it reasonable all prophesying should be restrained; but till then I have leave to discourse and to use my reason: and to my reason it seems not likely that neither Christ nor any of His apostles, not S. Peter himself, not S. Paul writing to the church of Rome, should speak the least word or tittle of the infallibility of their bishops; for it was certainly as convenient to tell us of a remedy, as to foretell that certainly there must needs be heresies, and need of a remedy. And it had been a certain determination of the question, if when so rare an opportunity was ministered in the question about circumcision, that they should have sent to Peter, who for his infallibility in ordinary and his power of headship, would not only with reason enough as being infallibly assisted, but also for his authority have best deter-

mined the question, if at least the first Christians had known so profitable and so excellent a secret. And although we have but little record that the first council of Jerusalem did much observe the solennities of law, and the forms of conciliary proceedings, and the ceremonials; yet so much of it as is recorded is against them: S. James and not S. Peter gave the final sentence; and although S. Peter determined the question *pro libertate*, yet S. James made the decree and the *assumentum* too, and gave sentence they should abstain from some things there mentioned, which by way of temper he judged most expedient: and so it passed. And S. Peter shewed no sign of a superior authority, nothing of superior jurisdiction; *ὅρα γὰρ αὐτὸν μετὰ κοινῆς πάντα ποιοῦντα γνώμης, οὐδὲν αὐθεντικῶς οὐδ' ἀρχικῶς*[c].

11. So that if the question be to be determined by scripture, it must either be ended by plain places, or by obscure. Plain places there are none, and these that are with greatest fancy pretended, are expounded by antiquity to contrary purposes. But if obscure places be all the *αὐθεντία*, by what means shall we infallibly find the sense of them? The pope's interpretation, though in all other cases it might be pretended, in this cannot; for it is the thing in question, and therefore cannot determine for itself. Either therefore we have also another infallible guide besides the pope, and so we have two foundations and two heads (for this as well as the other upon the same reason) or else (which is indeed the truth) there is no infallible way to be infallibly assured that the pope is infallible. Now it being against the common condition of men, above the pretences of all other governors ecclesiastical, against the analogy of scripture and the deportment of the other apostles, against the economy of the church and S. Peter's own entertainment, the presumption lies against him, and these places are to be left to their prime intentions, and not put upon the rack to force them to confess what they never thought.

12. But now for antiquity; if that be deposed in this question, there are so many circumstances to be considered to reconcile their words and their actions, that the process is more troublesome than the argument can be concluding, or the matter considerable: but I shall a little consider it, so far at least as to shew either antiquity said no such thing as is pretended; or if they did, it is but little considerable, because they did not believe themselves; their practice was the greatest evidence in the world against the pretence of their words. But I am much eased of a long disquisition in this particular (for I love not to prove a question by arguments whose authority is in itself as fallible, and by circumstances made as uncertain, as the question) by the saying of Æneas Sylvius[d], that before the Nicene council every man lived to himself, and small respect was had to the church of Rome; which practice could not well consist with the doctrine of their bishop's infallibility, and by consequence supreme judgment and

[c] S. Chrysost. hom. iii. in act. apost. [tom. ix. p. 23 D.]
[d] [cf. p. 462. not. i, supra.]

last resolution in matters of faith: but especially by the insinuation and consequent acknowledgment of Bellarmine[e], that for a thousand years together the fathers knew not of the doctrine of the pope's infallibility; for Nilus, Gerson, Almain, the divines of Paris, Alphonsus de Castro, and pope Adrian the sixth[f], persons who lived fourteen hundred years after Christ, affirm that infallibility is not seated in the pope's person, that he may err and sometimes actually hath: which is a clear demonstration that the church knew no such doctrine as this; there had been no decree, nor tradition, nor general opinion of the fathers or of any age before them; and therefore this opinion which Bellarmine would fain blast if he could, yet in his conclusion he says it is not *proprie hæretica:* a device and an expression of his own, without sense or precedent. But if the fathers had spoken of it and believed it, why may not a disagreeing person as well reject their authority when it is in behalf of Rome, as they of Rome without scruple cast them off when they speak against it? For as Bellarmine[g] being pressed with the authority of Nilus bishop of Thessalonica and other fathers, he says[g] that the pope acknowledges no fathers, but they are all his children, and therefore they cannot depose against him: and if that be true, why shall we take their testimonies for him? for if sons depose in their fathers' behalf, it is twenty to one but the adverse party will be cast, and therefore at the best it is but *suspectum testimonium.* But indeed this discourse signifies nothing but a perpetual uncertainty in such topics, and that where a violent prejudice or a concerning interest is engaged, men by not regarding what any man says proclaim to all the world that nothing is certain but divine authority.

13. But I will not take advantage of what Bellarmine says, nor what Stapleton or any one of them all say, for that will be but to press upon personal persuasions, or to urge a general question with a particular defailance[h], and the question is never the nearer to an end: for if Bellarmine says any thing that is not to another man's purpose or persuasion, that man will be tried by his own argument, not by another's. And so would every man do that loves his liberty, as all wise men do, and therefore retain it by open violence or private evasions. But to return.

14. An authority from Irenæus in this question, and on behalf of the pope's infallibility or the authority of the see of Rome, or of the necessity of communicating with them, is very fallible; for besides that there are almost a dozen answers to the words of the allegation, as is to be seen in those that trouble themselves in this question with the allegation, and answering such authorities; yet if they should make for the affirmative of this question, it is *protestatio contra factum.* For Irenæus had no such great opinion of pope Victor's infal-

[e] De Rom. pont., lib. iv. c. 2. § 'Secunda sententia.' [tom. i. col. 961 B.]

[f] [Omnes apud Bellarm. ubi supra.]

[g] ['For Bellarmine . . says,' C.]

[h] ['defaillance,' A, C.]

libility that he believed things in the same degree of necessity that the pope did; for therefore he chides him for excommunicating the Asian bishops ἀθρόως[l], 'all at a blow,' in the question concerning Easter-day; and in a question of faith he expressly disagreed from the doctrine of Rome, for Irenæus was of the millenary opinion, and believed it to be a tradition apostolical. Now if the church of Rome was of that opinion then, why is she not now? where is the succession of her doctrine? But if she was not of that opinion then, and Irenæus was, where was his belief of that church's infallibility? The same I urge concerning S. Cyprian, who was the head of a sect in opposition to the church of Rome in the question of rebaptization; and he and the abettors, Firmilian and the other bishops of Cappadocia and the voisinage, spoke harsh words of Stephen, and such as become them not to speak to an infallible doctor and the supreme head of the church. I will urge none of them to the disadvantage of that see, but only note the satires of Firmilian against him, because it is of good use to shew that it is possible for them in their ill carriage to blast the reputation and efficacy of a great authority. For he says[k] that that church did pretend the authority of the apostles, *cum in multis sacramentis divinæ rei a principio discrepet et ab ecclesia Hierosolymitana, et defamet Petrum et Paulum tanquam auctores.* And a little after, *Juste indignor,* says he, .. *apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, per quam veritas christianæ petræ aboletur.* Which words say plainly that for all the goodly pretence of apostolical authority, the church of Rome did then in many things of religion disagree from divine institution (and from the church of Jerusalem, which they had as great esteem of for religion sake, as of Rome for its principality) and that still in pretending to S. Peter and S. Paul they dishonoured those blessed apostles, and destroyed the honour of their pretence by their untoward prevarication. Which words I confess pass my skill to reconcile them to an opinion of infallibility; and although they were spoken by an angry person, yet they declare that in Africa they were not then persuaded as now they are at Rome: *Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit .. vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere*[l]*;* that was their belief then, and how the contrary hath grown up to that height where now it is, all the world is witness. And now I shall not need to note concerning S. Hierome[m] that he gave a compliment to Damasus that he would not have given to Liberius; *Qui tecum non colligit, spargit:* for it might be true enough of Damasus, who was a good bishop and a right believer; but if Liberius's name had been put instead of Damasus, the case had been altered with the name; for S. Hierome[n] did believe and write it so that Liberius had

[l] [Euseb. H. E., v. 24. p. 245.]

[k] [vid.] Ep. Firmiliani cont. Steph. ad Cypr. [in opp. S. Cypr. ep. lxxv. pp. 220, 5.]—Vide etiam ep. Cypriani ad Pompeium. [ep. lxxiv. p. 210 sqq.]

[l] Cyprian. epist. ad Quintum fratrem. [ep. lxxi. p. 194.]

[m] [ep. xiv. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 20.]

[n] De script. eccles. in Fortunatian. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 124.]

subscribed to Arianism. And if either he or any of the rest had believed the pope could not be a heretic, nor his faith fail, but be so good and of so competent authority as to be a rule to christendom, why did they not appeal to the pope in the Arian controversy? why was the bishop of Rome made a party and a concurrent, as other good bishops were, and not a judge and an arbitrator in the question? why did the fathers prescribe so many rules and cautions and provisoes for the discovery of heresy? why were the emperors at so much charge and the church at so much trouble, as to call and convene in councils respectively, to dispute so frequently, to write so sedulously, to observe all advantages against their adversaries and for the truth, and never offered to call for the pope to determine the question in his chair? Certainly no way could have been so expedite, none so concluding and peremptory, none could have convinced so certainly, none could have triumphed so openly over all discrepants as this, if they had known of any such thing as his being infallible, or that he had been appointed by Christ to be the judge of controversies. And therefore I will not trouble this discourse to excuse any more words either pretended or really said to this purpose of the pope, for they would but make books swell, and the question endless; I shall only to this purpose observe that the old writers were so far from believing the infallibility of the Roman church or bishop, that many bishops and many churches did actually live and continue out of the Roman communion; particularly S. Austin[o], who with two hundred and seventeen bishops and their successors for a hundred years together stood separate from that church, if we may believe their own records. So did Ignatius of Constantinople[p], S. Chrysostom, S. Cyprian, Firmilian, those bishops of Asia that separated in the question of Easter, and those of Africa in the question of rebaptization. But besides this, most of them had opinions which the church of Rome disavows now, and therefore did so then, or else she hath innovated in her doctrine; which though it be most true and notorious, I am sure she will never confess. But no excuse can be made for S. Austin's disagreeing and contesting in the question of appeals to Rome, the necessity of communicating infants, the absolute damnation of infants to the pains of hell if they die before baptism, and divers other particulars. It was a famous act of the bishops of Liguria and Istria[q], who seeing the pope of Rome consenting to the fifth synod in disparagement of the famous council of Chalcedon, which for their own

[o] Ubi illa Augustini et reliquorum prudentia? quis jam ferat crassissimæ ignorantiæ illam vocem in tot et tantis patribus?—Alan. Cop. [sc. Harpsfeldius ab Alano Copo editus,] dialog. p. 76, 77. [4to. Antwerp. 1566.]—Vide etiam Bonifac. ii. epist. ad Eulalium Alexandrinum, [concil. reg., tom. xi. p. 83.]—Lindanum in Panopl., lib. iv. cap. 89 in fine, [p. 446. fol. Col. Agr. 1575.]—Salmeron., tom. xii. tract. 68. § 'Ad canonem.' [p. 489.]—Sander. De visibili monarchia, lib. vii. n. 411. [p. 368.]

[p] Baron., tom. x. A.D. 878. [pp. 533, 543.]

[q] [Baron. ad A.D. 570. tom. vii. p. 533.—Pelag. ii. epp. 3 et 5. Harduin. concil., tom. iii. col. 414 sqq.]

interests they did not like of, they renounced subjection to his patriarchate, and erected a patriarch at Aquileia, who was afterwards translated to Venice, where his name remains to this day. It is also notorious that most of the fathers were of opinion that the souls of the faithful did not enjoy the beatific vision before doomsday; whether Rome was then of that opinion or no, I know not: I am sure now they are not, witness the councils of Florence and Trent: but of this I shall give a more full account afterwards. But if to all this which is already noted we add that great variety of opinions amongst the fathers and councils in assignation of the canon, they not consulting with the bishop of Rome, nor any of them thinking themselves bound to follow his rule in enumeration of the books of scripture, I think no more need to be said as to this particular.

15. Ninthly, but now if after all this there be some popes which were notorious heretics and preachers of false doctrine, some that made impious decrees both in faith and manners, some that have determined questions with egregious ignorance and stupidity, some with apparent sophistry, and many to serve their own ends most openly, I suppose then the infallibility will disband, and we may do to him as to other good bishops, believe him when there is cause, but if there be none, then to use our consciences; *non enim salvat christianum quod pontifex constanter affirmat præceptum suum esse justum, sed oportet illud examinari, et se juxta regulam superius datam dirigere*[r]. I would not instance and repeat the errors of dead bishops, if the extreme boldness of the pretence did not make it necessary. But if we may believe Tertullian[s], pope Zephyrinus approved the prophecies of Montanus, and upon that approbation granted peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, till Praxeas persuaded him to revoke his act. But let this rest upon the credit of Tertullian whether Zephyrinus were a Montanist or no; some such thing there was for certain. Pope Vigilius[t] denied two natures in Christ, and in his epistle to Theodora[u] the empress anathematized all them that said He had two natures in one person. S. Gregory[x] himself permitted priests to give confirmation, which is all one as if he should permit deacons to consecrate, they being by divine ordinance annexed to the higher orders: and upon this very ground Adrianus[y] affirms that the pope may err *in definiendis dogmatibus fidei*. And that we may not fear we shall want instances, we may

[r] Tract. de interdict. compos. a theol. Venet. prop. xiii. [apud Goldast. Monarch. Rom. imp., tom. iii. p. 333.—'Non sufficit christiano ut papa asseverando confirmet præceptum suum esse justum, sed oportet illud examinare, et semet ipsum ut supra dictum est regulare.']

[s] Lib. adv. Praxeam. [§ 1. p. 501 A.]

[t] Vid. Liberat. in breviario. cap. xxii. [Bibl. vett. patr. Galland., tom. xii. p. 157.]

[u] [But as to the genuineness of this epistle, see Baronius on A.D. 538; and Concil. Constantinop. iii. act. 14. tom. iii. col. 1366.]

[x] Durand. [sc. Durandus de S. Porciano, in lib.] iv. [sent.] dist. 7. q. 4. [p. 690 sqq. fol. Lugd. 1587.]

[y] Quæ. de Confirmat. art. ult. [Quæstt. in lib. iv. sent. fol. 55. 8vo. Lugd. 1546.]

to secure it take their own confession; *Nam multæ sunt decretales hæreticæ,* says Occham as he is cited by Almain[a], *et firmiter hoc credo,* says he for his own particular, *sed non licet dogmatizare oppositum quoniam sunt determinatæ.* So that we may as well see that it is certain that popes may be heretics, as that it is dangerous to say so, and therefore there are so few that teach it. All the patriarchs and the bishop of Rome himself subscribed to Arianism, as Baronius[a] confesses: and Gratian[b] affirms that pope Anastasius the second was strucken of God for communicating with the heretic Photinus. I know it will be made light of that Gregory the seventh saith the very exorcists of the Roman church are superior to princes. But what shall we think of that decretal of Gregory the third, who wrote to Boniface his legate in Germany[c], *quod illi quorum uxores infirmitate aliqua morbida debitum reddere noluerunt, aliis poterant nubere;* was this a doctrine fit for the head of the church, an infallible doctor? It was plainly, if any thing ever was, *doctrina dæmoniorum*[d], and is noted for such by Gratian[e], *caus.* xxxii. *q.* 7. *can.* '*Quod proposuisti;*' where the gloss also intimates that the same privilege was granted to the Englishmen by Gregory, *quia novi erant in fide.*—And sometimes we had little reason to expect much better: for not to instance in that learned discourse in the canon law *De majoritate et obedientia*[f], where the pope's supremacy over kings is proved from the first chapter of Genesis, and the pope is the sun and the emperor is the moon, for that was the fancy of one pope perhaps, though made authentic and doctrinal by him; it was (if it be possible) more ridiculous that pope Innocent the third[g] urges that the Mosaical law was still to be observed, and that upon this argument, *Sane,* saith he, *cum Deuteronomium lex secunda interpretetur, ex vi vocabuli comprobatur ut quod ibi decernitur in Novo Testamento debeat observari.* Worse yet; for when there was a corruption crept into the decree called *Sancta Romana*[h], where instead of these words, *Sedulii opus heroicis versibus descriptum,* all the old copies till of late read *hæreticis versibus descriptum,* this very mistake made many wise men (as Pierius[i] says) yea pope Adrian the sixth, no worse man, believe that all poetry was heretical, because forsooth pope Gelasius, whose decree that was, although he believed Sedulius to be a good catholic, yet as they thought he concluded his verses to be heretical. But these were ignorances; it hath been

[a] [In lib.] iii. [sent.] dist. xxiv. q. unica. [fol. 77 b.]
[a] [vid.] A.D. ccclvii. n. 44. [tom. iii. p. 713.]
[b] Dist. xix. c. 9. [col. 94.]
[c] Vid. Carranz. summ. concil. fol. 218, edit. Antwerp. [p. 666. 8vo. Rothom. 1641.]
[d] [1 Tim. iv. 1.]
[e] [Decret. col. 1787.]
[f] [Greg. decretal., lib. i. tit. 33. cap. 6. col. 401.]
[g] Cap. 'Per venerab.' Qui filii sint legitimi. [ibid., lib. iv. tit. 17. cap. 13. col. 1419.]
[h] Dist. xv. apud Gratian. [cap. 3. col. 59.]
[i] De sacerd. barb. [p. 9. 4to. Col. Agr. 1631.]

interests they did not like of, they renounced subjection to his patriarchate, and erected a patriarch at Aquileia, who was afterwards translated to Venice, where his name remains to this day. It is also notorious that most of the fathers were of opinion that the souls of the faithful did not enjoy the beatific vision before doomsday; whether Rome was then of that opinion or no, I know not: I am sure now they are not, witness the councils of Florence and Trent: but of this I shall give a more full account afterwards. But if to all this which is already noted we add that great variety of opinions amongst the fathers and councils in assignation of the canon, they not consulting with the bishop of Rome, nor any of them thinking themselves bound to follow his rule in enumeration of the books of scripture, I think no more need to be said as to this particular.

15. Ninthly, but now if after all this there be some popes which were notorious heretics and preachers of false doctrine, some that made impious decrees both in faith and manners, some that have determined questions with egregious ignorance and stupidity, some with apparent sophistry, and many to serve their own ends most openly, I suppose then the infallibility will disband, and we may do to him as to other good bishops, believe him when there is cause, but if there be none, then to use our consciences; *non enim salvat christianum quod pontifex constanter affirmat præceptum suum esse justum, sed oportet illud examinari, et se juxta regulam superius datam dirigere*[r]. I would not instance and repeat the errors of dead bishops, if the extreme boldness of the pretence did not make it necessary. But if we may believe Tertullian[s], pope Zephyrinus approved the prophecies of Montanus, and upon that approbation granted peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, till Praxeas persuaded him to revoke his act. But let this rest upon the credit of Tertullian whether Zephyrinus were a Montanist or no; some such thing there was for certain. Pope Vigilius[t] denied two natures in Christ, and in his epistle to Theodora[u] the empress anathematized all them that said He had two natures in one person. S. Gregory[x] himself permitted priests to give confirmation, which is all one as if he should permit deacons to consecrate, they being by divine ordinance annexed to the higher orders: and upon this very ground Adrianus[y] affirms that the pope may err *in definiendis dogmatibus fidei*. And that we may not fear we shall want instances, we may

[r] Tract. de interdict. compos. a theol. Venet. prop. xiii. [apud Goldast. Monarch. Rom. imp., tom. iii. p. 333.—'Non sufficit christiano ut papa asseverando confirmet præceptum suum esse justum, sed oportet illud examinare, et semet ipsum ut supra dictum est regulare.']

[s] Lib. adv. Praxeam. [§ 1. p. 501 A.]

[t] Vid. Liberat. in breviario. cap. xxii. [Bibl. vett. patr. Galland., tom. xii. p. 157.]

[u] [But as to the genuineness of this epistle, see Baronius on A.D. 538; and Concil. Constantinop. iii. act. 14. tom. iii. col. 1366.]

[x] Durand. [sc. Durandus de S. Porciano, in lib.] iv. [sent.] dist. 7. q. 4. [p. 690 sqq. fol. Lugd. 1587.]

[y] Quæ. de Confirmat. art. ult. [Quæstt. in lib. iv. sent. fol. 55. 8vo. Lugd. 1546.]

to secure it take their own confession; *Nam multæ sunt decretales hæreticæ,* says Occham as he is cited by Almain[a], *et firmiter hoc credo,* says he for his own particular, *sed non licet dogmatizare oppositum quoniam sunt determinatæ.* So that we may as well see that it is certain that popes may be heretics, as that it is dangerous to say so, and therefore there are so few that teach it. All the patriarchs and the bishop of Rome himself subscribed to Arianism, as Baronius[a] confesses: and Gratian[b] affirms that pope Anastasius the second was strucken of God for communicating with the heretic Photinus. I know it will be made light of that Gregory the seventh saith the very exorcists of the Roman church are superior to princes. But what shall we think of that decretal of Gregory the third, who wrote to Boniface his legate in Germany[c], *quod illi quorum uxores infirmitate aliqua morbida debitum reddere noluerunt, aliis poterant nubere;* was this a doctrine fit for the head of the church, an infallible doctor? It was plainly, if any thing ever was, *doctrina dæmoniorum*[d], and is noted for such by Gratian[e], *caus.* xxxii. *q.* 7. *can.* '*Quod proposuisti;*' where the gloss also intimates that the same privilege was granted to the Englishmen by Gregory, *quia novi erant in fide.*—And sometimes we had little reason to expect much better: for not to instance in that learned discourse in the canon law *De majoritate et obedientia*[f], where the pope's supremacy over kings is proved from the first chapter of Genesis, and the pope is the sun and the emperor is the moon, for that was the fancy of one pope perhaps, though made authentic and doctrinal by him; it was (if it be possible) more ridiculous that pope Innocent the third[g] urges that the Mosaical law was still to be observed, and that upon this argument, *Sane,* saith he, *cum Deuteronomium lex secunda interpretetur, ex vi vocabuli comprobatur ut quod ibi decernitur in Novo Testamento debeat observari.* Worse yet; for when there was a corruption crept into the decree called *Sancta Romana*[h], where instead of these words, *Sedulii opus heroicis versibus descriptum,* all the old copies till of late read *hæreticis versibus descriptum,* this very mistake made many wise men (as Pierius[i] says) yea pope Adrian the sixth, no worse man, believe that all poetry was heretical, because forsooth pope Gelasius, whose decree that was, although he believed Sedulius to be a good catholic, yet as they thought he concluded his verses to be heretical. But these were ignorances; it hath been

[a] [In lib.] iii. [sent.] dist. xxiv. q. unica. [fol. 77 b.]
[a] [vid.] A.D. ccclvii. n. 44. [tom. iii. p. 713.]
[b] Dist. xix. c. 9. [col. 94.]
[c] Vid. Carranz. summ. concil. fol. 218, edit. Antwerp. [p. 666. 8vo. Rothom. 1641.]
[d] [1 Tim. iv. 1.]
[e] [Decret. col. 1787.]
[f] [Greg. decretal., lib. i. tit. 33. cap. 6. col. 401.]
[g] Cap. 'Per venerab.' Qui filii sint legitimi. [ibid., lib. iv. tit. 17. cap. 13. col. 1419.]
[h] Dist. xv. apud Gratian. [cap. 3. col. 59.]
[i] De sacerd. barb. [p. 9. 4to. Col. Agr. 1631.]

worse amongst some others, whose errors have been more malicious. Pope Honorius was condemned by the sixth general synod, and his epistles burnt; and in the seventh action of the eighth synod the acts of the Roman council under Adrian the second are recited, in which it is said that Honorius was justly anathematized because he was convict of heresy. Bellarmine says it is probable that pope Adrian and the Roman council were deceived with false copies of the sixth synod, and that Honorius was no heretic. To this I say, that although the Roman synod, and the eighth general synod, and pope Adrian, all together are better witnesses for the thing than Bellarmine's conjecture is against it; yet if we allow his conjecture, we shall lose nothing in the whole: for either the pope is no infallible doctor, but may be a heretic, as Honorius was; or else a council is to us no infallible determiner. I say, as to us; for if Adrian and the whole Roman council and the eighth general were all cozened with false copies of the sixth synod, which was so little a while before them, and whose acts were transacted and kept in the theatre and records of the catholic church, he is a bold man that will be confident that he hath true copies now. So that let which they please stand or fall, let the pope be a heretic or the councils be deceived and palpably abused (for the other, we will dispute it upon other instances and arguments when we shall know which part they will choose) in the meantime we shall get in the general what we lose in the particular. This only, this device of saying the copies of the councils were false was the stratagem[k] of Albertus Pighius[l] nine hundred years after the thing was done; of which invention Pighius was presently admonished, blamed, and wished to recant. Pope Nicholas explicated the mystery of the sacrament with so much ignorance and zeal, that in condemning Berengarius he taught a worse impiety. But what need I any more instances? It is a confessed case[m] by Baronius, by Biel, by Stella, Almain, Occham, and Canus, and generally by the best scholars in the church of Rome, that a pope may be a heretic, and that some of them actually were so; and no less than three general councils did believe the same thing, viz., sixth, seventh, and eighth, as Bellarmine is pleased to acknowledge in his fourth book *De pontifice Romano, c.* xi. *resp. ad arg.* 4[n]; and the canon '*Si papa,*' *dist.* xl.[o] affirms it in express terms that a pope is judicable and punishable in that case. But there is no wound but some empiric or other will pretend to cure it; and there is a cure for this too. For though it be true that if a pope were a heretic the church might depose him, yet no pope can be a heretic; not but that the man may, but the pope cannot, for

[k] ['stategem,' C.]

[l] Vide [Alb. Pighii] diatrib. de act. vi. et vii[æ]. synod. [fol. Colon. 1541.] præfatione ad lectorem, et Dominicum Bannes [al. Bañes, in Aquinat.] 2. 2[æ]. q. i. a. 10. dub. 2. [tom. iii. p. 58 B.]

[m] Picus Mirand. in exposit. theorem. iv. [tom. ii. p. 176 fin. fol. Basil. 1601.]

[n] [tom. i. col. 1004.]

[o] [cap. 6. Gratian. decret. col. 211.]

he is *ipso facto* no pope, for he is no Christian; so Bellarmine[p]: and so when you think you have him fast, he is gone, and nothing of the pope left. But who sees not the extreme folly of this evasion? For besides that out of fear and caution he grants more than he needs, more than was sought for in the question, the pope hath no more privilege than the abbot of Cluny; for he cannot be a heretic, nor be deposed by a council: for if he be manifestly a heretic, he is *ipso facto* no abbot, for he is no Christian; and if the pope be a heretic 'privately and occultly,' for that he may be accused and judged, said the gloss upon the canon '*Si papa,' dist.* xl.[q]; and the abbot of Cluny and one of his meanest monks can be no more, therefore the case is all one. But this is fitter to make sport with[r], than to interrupt a serious discourse. And therefore although the canon *Sancta Romana*[s] approves all the decretals of popes, yet that very decretal hath not decreed it firm enough, but that they are so warily received by them, that when they list they are pleased to dissent from them[t]. And it is evident in the Extravagant of Sixtus the fourth[u], *Com. De reliquiis;* who appointed a feast of the immaculate conception, a special office for the day, and indulgences enough to the observers of it: and yet the Dominicans were so far from believing the pope to be infallible and his decree authentic, that they declaimed against it in their pulpits so furiously and so long, till they were prohibited under pain of excommunication to say the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin. Now what solennity can be more required for the pope to make a cathedral determination of an article? The article was so concluded that a feast was instituted for its celebration, and pain of excommunication threatened to them which should preach the contrary: nothing more solemn, nothing more confident and severe. And yet after all this, to shew that whatsoever those people would have us to believe, they'll believe what they list themselves, this thing was not determined *de fide,* saith Victorellus[v]; nay, the author of the gloss of the canon law[x] hath these express words, *De festo conceptionis nihil dicitur quia celebrandum non est, sicut in multis regionibus fit, et maxime in Anglia; et hæc est ratio, quia in peccatis concepta fuit sicut et cæteri sancti.* And the commissaries of Sixtus the fifth and Gregory the thirteenth did not expunge these words, but left them upon re-

[p] Lib. ii. cap. 30, ubi supra. § 'Est ergo.' [tom. i. col. 836.]

[q] [vid. not. o, supra.]

[r] Vide Alphons. a Castr. adv. hæres., lib. i. cap. 4. [col. 20.] hoc lemma ridentem affabre.

[s] [p. 477. not. h, supra.]

[t] Vid. etiam Innocentium [iii.] de consecrat. pontif. serm. ii. [tom. i. p. 188.] Act. 7. viii[e]. synodi, [tom. v. col. 862 sqq.] et Concil. v. sub Symmacho. [tom. ii. col. 983.]—Vide Collat. viii. can. 12. [tom. iii. col. 199.] ubi pp. judicialem sententiam P. Vigilii in causa trium capitulorum damnarunt expresse.

[u] Extrav. comm. Extrav. 'grave.' [lib. iii. ad calc. Decretal. Bonifac., col. 284 sq.] Tit. x. [?]

[v] De angelor. custod. fol. 59. [vid., lib. ii. fol. 110 sqq. 4to. Patav. 1605.]

[x] De consecrat. dist. iii. can. 'Pronunciand.' gloss. verb. 'Nativit.' [Gratian. decret. col. 2140.]

cord, not only against a received and more approved opinion of the Jesuits and Franciscans, but also in plain defiance of a decree made by their visible head of the church, who (if ever any thing was decreed by a pope with an intent to oblige all christendom) decreed this to that purpose[y].

16. So that without taking particular notice of it, that egregious sophistry and flattery of the late writers of the Roman church is in this instance, besides divers others before mentioned, clearly made invalid; for here the bishop of Rome, not as a private doctor but as popè, not by declaring his own opinion but with an intent to oblige the church, gave sentence in a question which the Dominicans will still account *pro non determinata*. And every decretal recorded in the canon law if it be false in the matter, is just such another instance: and Alphonsus a Castro says it to the same purpose, in the instance of Celestine dissolving marriages for heresy, *Neque Cælestini error talis fuit qui soli negligentiæ imputari debeat, ita ut illum errasse dicamus velut privatam personam et non ut papam; . . quoniam hujusmodi Cælestini definitio habebatur in antiquis decretalibus, in cap. 'Laudabilem,' titulo 'De conversione infidelium;' quam ego ipse vidi et legi.—Lib. i. adv. hær. cap.* 4.[z] And therefore 'tis a most intolerable folly to pretend that the pope cannot err in his chair, though he may err in his closet, and may maintain a false opinion even to his death. For besides that it is sottish to think that either he would not have the world of his own opinion, as all men naturally would, or that if he were set in his chair, he would determine contrary to himself in his study (and therefore to represent it as possible they are fain to fly to a miracle, for which they have no colour, neither instructions nor insinuation, nor warrant, nor promise: besides that it were impious and unreasonable to depose him for heresy who may so easily, even by setting himself in his chair and reviewing his theorems, be cured) it is also against a very great experience. For besides the former allegations, it is most notorious that pope Alexander the third[a] in a council at Rome of three hundred archbishops and bishops, A.D. 1179, condemned Peter Lombard of heresy in a matter of great concernment, no less than something about the Incarnation; from which sentence he was after thirty-six years abiding it absolved by pope Innocent the third[b] without repentance or dereliction of the opinion. Now if this sentence was not a cathedral dictate as solemn and great as could be expected or as is said to be necessary to oblige all christendom, let the great hyperaspists of the Roman church be judges, who tell us that a particular council with the pope's confirmation is made ecumenical by adoption, and is infallible, and

[y] Hac in perpetuum valitura constitutione statuimus, &c. 'De reliquiis,' &c. Extrav. comm. Sixt. iv. cap. 1. [not. u, supra.]

[z] [not. r, supra.]

[a] [Epist. ad Willelm. Senon. archiep. in concill. Harduin., tom. vi. col. 1689.—Cf. concil. Paris. A.D. 1170. ibid. col. 1625.]

[b] [concil. Lateran. iv. can. 2. tom. vii. col. 17.]

obliges all christendom; so Bellarmine[c]: and therefore he says that it is *temerarium, erroneum, et proximum hæresi,* to deny it. But whether it be or not it is all one as to my purpose. For it is certain that in a particular council confirmed by the pope, if ever, then and there the pope sat himself in his chair; and it is as certain that he sat besides the cushion, and determined ridiculously and falsely in this case. But this is a device for which there is no scripture, no tradition, no one dogmatical resolute saying of any father, Greek or Latin, for above a thousand years after Christ: and themselves when they list can acknowledge as much. And therefore Bellarmine's[d] saying I perceive is believed by them to be true, that there are many things in the Decretal epistles[e] which make not articles to be *de fide.* And therefore *Non est necessario credendum determinatis per summum pontificem,* says Almain[f]. And this serves their turns in every thing they do not like, and therefore I am resolved it shall serve my turn also for something, and that is, that the matter of the pope's infallibility is so ridiculous and improbable that they do not believe it themselves. Some of them clearly practised the contrary; and although pope Leo the tenth hath determined the pope to be above a council, yet the Sorbonne to this day scorn it at the very heart. And I might urge upon them that scorn that Almain[g] truly enough by way of argument alleges, 'It is a wonder that they who affirm the pope cannot err in judgment do not also affirm that he cannot sin; they are like enough to say so,' says he, 'if the vicious lives of the popes did not make a daily confutation of such flattery.' Now for my own particular I am as confident, and think it as certain, that popes are actually deceived in matters of christian doctrine, as that they do prevaricate the laws of christian piety. And therefore Alphonsus a Castro[h] calls them *impudentes papæ assentatores* that ascribe to him infallibility in judgment or interpretation of scripture.

17. But if themselves did believe it heartily, what excuse is there in the world for the strange uncharitableness or supine negligence of the popes, that they do not set themselves in their chair, and write infallible commentaries, and determine all controversies without error, and blast all heresies with the word of their mouth, declare what is and what is not *de fide,* that his disciples and confidents may agree upon it, reconcile the Franciscans and Dominicans, and expound all mysteries? For it cannot be imagined but he that was endued with

[c] Lib. ii. de Concil. cap. 5. [tom. ii. col. 74.]

[d] De pontif. Rom. [lib. iv.] c. xiv. § 'Respondeo.' [tom. i. col. 1018.]

[e] Proverbialiter olim dictum erat de Decretalibus, Male cum rebus humanis actum esse, ex quo Decretis alæ accesserunt; scil. cum Decretales post Decretum Gratiani sub nomine Gregorii noni edebantur.

[f] In iii. sent. d. 24. q. in conl. [? concl.] 6. dub. 6. in fine. [fol. 77 b.]

[g] De auctorit. eccles., cap. 10. in fine. [fol. lviii. b. Inter 'Aurea opuscula,' fol. Par. 1517.]

[h] Lib. i. cap. 4. advers. hæres. edit. Paris. 1534. In seqq. non [?] expurgantur ista verba, at idem sensus manet.

so supreme power in order to so great ends, was also fitted with proportionable, that is extraordinary, personal abilities, succeeding and derived upon the persons of all the popes. And then the doctors of his church need not trouble themselves with study nor writing explications of scripture, but might wholly attend to practical devotion, and leave all their scholastical wranglings, the distinguishing opinions of their orders, and they might have a fine church, something like fairy-land, or Lucian's kingdom in the moon. But if they say they cannot do this when they list, but when they are moved to it by the Spirit, then we are never the nearer: for so may the bishop of Angoulême write infallible commentaries when the Holy Ghost moves him to it; for I suppose His motions are not ineffectual, but He will sufficiently assist us in performing of what He actually moves us to. But among so many hundred decrees which the popes of Rome have made, or confirmed and attested, (which is all one) I would fain know in how many of them did the Holy Ghost assist them? If they know it, let them declare it, that it may be certain which of their decretals are *de fide;* for as yet none of his own church knows. If they do not know, then neither can we know it from them, and then we are as uncertain as ever. And besides, the Holy Ghost may possibly move him, and he by his ignorance of it may neglect so profitable a motion; and then his promise of infallible assistance will be to very little purpose, because it is with very much fallibility applicable to practice. And therefore it is absolutely useless to any man or any church; because suppose it settled *in thesi* that the pope is infallible, yet whether he will do his duty and perform those conditions of being assisted which are required of him, or whether he be a secret simoniac (for if he be he is *ipso facto* no pope) or whether he be a bishop, or priest, or a Christian, being all uncertain, every one of these depending upon the intention and power of the baptizer or ordainer, which also are fallible, because they depend upon the honesty and power of other men; we cannot be infallibly certain of any pope that he is infallible: and therefore when our questions are determined, we are never the nearer, but may hug ourselves in an imaginary truth, the certainty of finding truth out depending upon so many fallible and contingent circumstances. And therefore the thing, if it were true, being so to no purpose, it is to be presumed that God never gave a power so impertinently, and from whence no benefit can accrue to the christian church, for whose use and benefit, if at all, it must needs have been appointed.

18. But I am too long in this impertinency. If I were bound to call any man master upon earth and to believe him upon his own affirmative and authority, I would of all men least follow him that pretends he is infallible and cannot prove it. For that he cannot prove it makes me as uncertain as ever; and that he pretends to infallibility, makes him careless of using such means which will morally secure those wise persons who, knowing their own aptness

to be deceived, use what endeavours they can to secure themselves from error, and so become the better and more probable guides.

19. Well, thus far we are come: although we are secured in fundamental points from involuntary error by the plain, express, and dogmatical places of scripture; yet in other things we are not, but may be invincibly mistaken, because of the obscurity and difficulty in the controverted parts of scripture, by reason of the incertainty of the means of its interpretation, since tradition is of an uncertain reputation, and sometimes evidently false; councils are contradictory to each other, and therefore certainly are equally deceived many of them, and therefore all may; and then the popes of Rome are very likely to mislead us, but cannot ascertain us of truth in matter of question; and in this world we believe in part, and prophesy in part, and this imperfection shall never be done away till we be translated to a more glorious state: either then we must throw our chances and get truth by accident or predestination, or else we must lie safe in a mutual toleration and private liberty of persuasion, unless some other anchor can be thought upon where we may fasten our floating vessels and ride safely.

§ 8. Of the disability of fathers or writers ecclesiastical to determine our questions with certainty and truth.

1. THERE are some that think they can determine all questions in the world by two or three sayings of the fathers, or by the consent of so many as they will please to call a concurrent testimony: but this consideration will soon be at an end; for if the fathers when they are witnesses of tradition do not always speak truth, as it happened in the case of Papias and his numerous followers for almost three ages together, then is their testimony more improbable when they dispute or write commentaries.

2. The fathers of the first ages spake unitedly concerning divers questions of secret theology, and yet were afterwards contradicted by one personage of great reputation, whose credit had so much influence upon the world as to make the contrary opinion become popular: why then may not we have the same liberty, when so plain an uncertainty is in their persuasions, and so great contrariety in their doctrines? But this is evident in the case of absolute predestination, which till S. Austin's time no man preached, but all taught the contrary; and yet the reputation of this one excellent man altered the scene. But if he might dissent from so general a doctrine, why may not we do so too (it being pretended that he is so excellent a precedent to be followed) if we have the same reason? He had no more authority nor dispensation to dissent than any bishop hath now. And therefore S. Austin hath dealt ingenuously[1], and as he took this liberty to himself, so he denies it not to others, but indeed forces them to preserve their own liberty; and therefore when S. Hierome[k] had a great mind to follow the fathers in a point that he fancied, and

[1] ['ingeniously,' A.]

[k] [Ep. lxxiv. tom. iv. part. 2. col. 620.]

the best security he had was, *Patiaris me cum talibus errare,* S. Austin would not endure it, but answered his reason, and neglected the authority: and therefore it had been most unreasonable that we should do that now, though in his behalf, which he towards greater personages (for so they were then) at that time judged to be unreasonable.—It is a plain recession from antiquity which was determined by the council of Florence[l], *piorum animas purgatas, &c. mox in cœlum recipi, et intueri clare ipsum Deum trinum et unum sicuti est;* as who please to try, may see it dogmatically resolved to the contrary by Justin Martyr[m], by Irenæus[n], by Origen[o], by S. Chrysostom[p], Theodoret[q], Arethas Cæsariensis[r], Euthymius[s], who may answer for the Greek church. And it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek church by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine council, where the Latins acted their masterpiece of wit and stratagem[t], the greatest that hath been till the famous and superpolitic design of Trent. And for the Latin church, Tertullian[u], S. Ambrose[x], S. Austin[y], S. Hilary[z], Prudentius[a], Lactantius[b], Victorinus Martyr[c], and S. Bernard[d], are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atriis,* where they expect the resurrection of their bodies and the glorification of their souls; and though they all believe them to be happy, yet they enjoy not the beatific vision before the resurrection. Now there being so full a consent of fathers (for many more may be added) and the decree of pope John XXII. besides, who was so confident for his decree that he commanded the university of Paris to swear that they would preach it and no other, and that none should be promoted to degrees in theology that did not swear the like, as Occham[e], Gerson[f], Marsilius[g], and Adrianus[h], report: since it is esteemed lawful to dissent from all these, I hope no

[l] Sess. ult. [tom. ix. col. 958 A.]
[m] Qu. 60. [vid. 8, 38, et passim,] ad christian. [pp. 543, 6.]
[n] Lib. v. [cap. 31. p. 330.]
[o] Hom. vii. in Levit. [§ 2. tom. ii. p. 222.]
[p] Hom. xxxix. in 1 Cor. [§ 3. tom. x. col. 365 sqq.]
[q] In cap. xi. ad Hebr. [init. et fin., tom. iii. pp. 613, 623.]
[r] In c. vi. Apoc. [p. 920 sqq.]
[s] In xvi. c. Luc. [sc. de Divite et Lazaro—Sed vide locum.]
[t] ['strategem,' C.]
[u] Lib. iv. adv. Marc. [c. 34. p. 450 fin.]
[x] L. de Cain [et Abel,] c. 2. [tom. i. col. 186.]
[y] Ep. cxi. ad Fortunatian. [al. ep. cxlviii. tom. ii. col. 496 sqq.]
[z] In ps. cxxxviii. [§ 22. col. 514 D.]
[a] De exeq. defunct. [per tot. præsertim lin. 33 sqq. tom. i. p. 353.]
[b] Lib. vii. cap. 21. [tom. i. p. 574.]
[c] In c. vi. Apoc. [p. 139 H.]
[d] Serm. iii. de omn. sanctis. [col. 290 sqq.]—Vid. etiam S. Aug. in Enchir., cap. 108. [leg. 109. tom. vi. col. 237.] et lib. xii. de civ. Dei, cap. 9. [tom. vi. col. 308.] et in ps. xxxvi. [ver. 9. tom. iv. col. 263.] et in lib. i. Retract. cap. 14. [tom. i. col. 22.]—Vid. insuper testimonia quæ collegit Spalat., lib. v. c. 8. n. 98. De republ. eccles. [p. 376. fol. Lond. 1620.] et Sixt. Senens., lib. vi. annot. 345. [tom. ii. p. 962 sqq.]
[e] In opere xc. dierum. [Item in Dialogo, lib. v. cap. 2.—Apud Goldast. Monarch. Rom. imp., tom. iii. p. 470. fol. Francof. 1621.]
[f] Serm. de pasch. [tom. iv. col. 491.]
[g] [scil. Marsil. Inguen.] in iv. sent. [q. xiii. art. 3.]
[h] [Seu Hadrianus vi. papa, cogn. Florentius.] In iv. [sentent.] de sacram. confirmat. [prop. fin. fol. 55. ed. 8vo. Lugd. 1546.]

man will be so unjust to press other men to consent to an authority which he himself judges to be incompetent.—These two great instances are enough; but if more were necessary, I could instance in the opinion of the Chiliasts, maintained by the second and third centuries, and disavowed ever since: in the doctrine of communicating infants, taught and practised as necessary by the fourth and fifth centuries, and detested by the Latin church in all the following ages: in the variety of opinions concerning the very form of baptism, some keeping close to the institution and the words of its first sanction, others affirming it to be sufficient if it be administered *in nomine Christi;* particularly S. Ambrose, pope Nicholas the first[i], Ven. Bede[k], and S. Bernard[l], besides some writers of after ages, as Hugo de S. Victore[m] and the doctors generally his contemporaries. And it would not be inconsiderable to observe, that if any synod, general, national, or provincial, be receded from by the church of the later age (as there have been very many) then so many fathers as were then assembled and united in opinion are esteemed no authority to determine our persuasions. Now suppose two hundred fathers assembled in such a council, if all they had writ books and authorities, and two hundred authorities had been alleged in confirmation of an opinion, it would have made a mighty noise, and loaded any man with an insupportable prejudice that should dissent: and yet every opinion maintained against the authority of any one council though but provincial, is in its proportion such a violent recession and neglect of the authority and doctrine of so many fathers as were then assembled, who did as much declare their opinion in those assemblies by their suffrages, as if they had writ it in so many books; and their opinion is more considerable in the assembly than in their writings, because it was more deliberate, assisted, united, and more dogmatical. In pursuance of this observation it is to be noted by way of instance, that S. Austin and two hundred and seventeen bishops, and all their successors[n] for a whole age together, did consent in denying appeals to Rome; and yet the authority of so many fathers, all true catholics, is of no force now at Rome in this question: but if it be in a matter they like, one of these fathers alone is sufficient. The doctrine of S. Austin alone brought in the festival and veneration of the assumption of the blessed Virgin; and the hard sentence passed at Rome upon unbaptized infants, and the Dominican opinion concerning pre-

[i] De consecrat. dist. iv. c. [24.] 'A quodam Judæo,' [Gratian. decret. col. 2160.]

[k] In c. x. Act. [tom. v. col. 648.]

[l] Epist. cccxl. [col. 1648.]

[m] [De sacram. fid., lib. ii. part. 6. cap. 2. tom. iii. fol. 283 b. sqq.]

[n] Vid. epist. Bonifacii ii. apud Nicolinum, tom. ii. Concil. [fol. Ven. 1585.] pag. 544, et exemplar precum Eulalii apud eundem, ibid. p. 545; qui anathematizat omnes decisores suos, qui in ea causa, Romæ se opponendo, rectæ fidei regulam prævaricati sunt; inter quos tamen fuit Augustinus, quem pro maledicto Cælestinus tacite agnoscit, admittendo sc. exemplar precum.—Vid. Doctor. Marta de jurisdict., part. iv. [cas. 164.] p. 273. [fol. Aven. 1616.] et Erasm. annot. in Hieron. præfat. in Daniel. [opp. S. Hieron. ed. Erasm., tom. iii. p. 29.]

determination, derived from him alone as from their original. So that if a father speaks for them, it is wonderful to see what tragedies are stirred up against them that dissent, as is to be seen in that excellent nothing of Campian's Ten Reasons[o]. But if the fathers be against them, then *patres in quibusdam non leviter lapsi sunt*, says Bellarmine[p]; and *constat quosdam ex præcipuis*, it is certain the chiefest of them have foully erred. Nay, Posa[q], Salmeron[r], and Wadding[s], in the question of the immaculate conception, make no scruple to dissent from antiquity, to prefer new doctors before the old; and to justify themselves, bring instances in which the church of Rome had determined against the fathers. And it is not excuse enough to say that singly the fathers may err, but if they concur they are certain testimony. For there is no question this day disputed by persons that are willing to be tried by the fathers, so generally attested on either side, as some points are which both sides dislike severally or conjunctly. And therefore 'tis not honest for either side to press the authority of the fathers as a concluding argument in matter of dispute, unless themselves will be content to submit in all things to the testimony of an equal number of them; which I am certain neither side will do.

3. If I should reckon all the particular reasons against the certainty of this topic, it would be more than needs as to this question, and therefore I will abstain from all disparagement of those worthy personages, who were excellent lights to their several dioceses and cures. And therefore I will not instance that Clemens Alexandrinus[t] taught that Christ felt no hunger or thirst, but eat only to make demonstration of the verity of His human nature; nor that S. Hilary[u] taught that Christ in His sufferings had no sorrow; nor that Origen[x] taught the pains of hell not to have an eternal duration; nor that S. Cyprian[y] taught rebaptization; nor that Athenagoras[z] condemned second marriages; nor that S. John Damascene[a] said Christ only prayed in appearance, not really and in truth: I will let them all rest in peace, and their memories in honour: for if I should enquire into the particular probations of this article, I must do to them as I should be forced to do now; if any man should say that the writings of the schoolmen were excellent argument and authority to determine men's persuasions, I must consider their writings, and observe their defailances, their contradictions, the weakness of their arguments, the

[o] [e. g. Rat. x. p. 124 sqq. 8vo. Antuerp. 1631.]
[p] De verbo Dei, l. iii. c. 10. sect. 'Dices.' [tom. i. col. 195.]
[q] [al. Poza, Elucidar., lib. iv.]
[r] [In Rom. disp. 50 sqq. tom. xiii. p. 462 sqq.]
[s] ['Legatio' &c. 'de immac. concept.' sect. ii. tract. 9. § 6. p. 226 et alibi.]
[t] Strom., lib. iii. [vid. cap. 6. p. 533.] et vi. [cap. 9. p. 775.]
[u] [In psalm. liii. § 12. col. 100; sed vid. loc.]
[x] [In Rom., lib. v. § 7. (tom. iv. p. 560) et alibi.]
[y] [vid. p. 474. not. k, supra.]
[z] [Legat. pro christ., cap. xxviii. p. 130.]
[a] [vid. De fid. orthod., lib. iv. cap. 18. tom. i. p. 287.]

misallegations of scripture, their inconsequent deductions, their false opinions, and all the weaknesses of humanity, and the failings of their persons; which no good man is willing to do, unless he be compelled to it by a pretence that they are infallible; or that they are followed by men even into errors or impiety. And therefore since there is enough in the former instances to cure any such mispersuasion and prejudice, I will not instance in the innumerable particularities that might persuade us to keep our liberty entire or to use it discreetly. For it is not to be denied but that great advantages are to be made by their writings, *et probabile est quod omnibus, quod pluribus, quod sapientibus videtur:* If one wise man says a thing, it is an argument to me to believe it in its degree of probation, that is, proportionable to such an assent as the authority of a wise man can produce, and when there is nothing against it that is greater; and so in proportion higher and higher as more wise men (such as the old doctors were) do affirm it. But that which I complain of is, that we look upon wise men that lived long ago with so much veneration and mistake, that we reverence them not for having been wise men, but that they lived long since. But when the question is concerning authority, there must be something to build it on; a divine commandment, human sanction, excellency of spirit, and greatness of understanding, on which things all human authority is regularly built. But now if we had lived in their times (for so we must look upon them now as they did who without prejudice beheld them) I suppose we should then have beheld them as we in England look on those prelates who are of great reputation for learning and sanctity: here only is the difference; when persons are living, their authority is depressed by their personal defailances, and the contrary interests of their contemporaries, which disband when they are dead, and leave their credit entire upon the reputation of those excellent books and monuments of learning and piety which are left behind. But beyond this, why the bishop of Hippo shall have greater authority than the bishop of the Canaries, *cæteris paribus*, I understand not. For did they that lived (to instance) in S. Austin's time, believe all that he wrote? If they did, they were much to blame; or else himself was to blame for retracting much of it a little before his death. And if while he lived his affirmative was no more authority than derives from the credit of one very wise man, against whom also very wise men were opposed, I know not why his authority should prevail further now; for there is nothing added to the strength of his reason since that time, but only that he hath been in great esteem with posterity. And if that be all, why the opinion of the following ages shall be of more force than the opinion of the first ages, against whom S. Austin in many things clearly did oppose himself, I see no reason. Or whether the first ages were against him or no, yet that he is approved by the following ages is no better argument; for it makes his authority not be innate but derived from the opinion of others, and so to be *pre-*

caria, and to depend upon others, who if they should change their opinions (and such examples there have been many) then there were nothing left to urge our consent to him, which when it was at the best was only this, because he had the good fortune to be believed by them that came after, he must be so still: and because it was no argument for the old doctors before him, this will not be very good in his behalf. The same I say of any company of them, I say not so of all of them, it is to no purpose to say it; for there is no question this day in contestation, in the explication of which all the old writers did consent. In the assignation of the canon of scripture they never did consent for six hundred years together; and then by that time the bishops had agreed indifferently well, and but indifferently, upon that, they fell out in twenty more: and except it be in the apostles' creed, and articles of such nature, there is nothing which may with any colour be called a consent, much less tradition universal.

4. But I will rather choose to shew the uncertainty of this topic by such an argument which was not in the fathers' power to help, such as makes no invasion upon their great reputation, which I desire should be preserved as sacred as it ought. For other things, let who please read M. Daillè *Du vrai usage des Peres*[b]: but I shall only consider that the writings of the fathers have been so corrupted by the intermixture of heretics, so many false books put forth in their names, so many of their writings lost which would more clearly have explicated their sense, and at last an open profession made and a trade of making the fathers speak not what themselves thought but what other men pleased, that it is a great instance of God's providence and care of His church, that we have so much good preserved in the writings which we receive from the fathers, and that all truth is not as clear gone as is the certainty of their great authority and reputation.

5. The publishing books with the inscription of great names, began in S. Paul's time; for some had troubled the church of Thessalonica with a false epistle in S. Paul's name, against the inconvenience of which he arms them in 2 Thess. ii. 1. And this increased daily in the church. The Arians[c] wrote an epistle to Constantine under the name of Athanasius, and the Eutychians[d] wrote against Cyril of Alexandria under the name of Theodoret; and of the age in which the seventh synod was kept, Erasmus[e] reports, *Libris falso celebrium virorum titulo commendatis scatere omnia;* it was then a public business, and a trick not more base than public. But it was more ancient than so, and it is memorable in the books attributed to S. Basil, containing thirty chapters *De Spiritu sancto,* whereof fifteen were plainly added[f] by another hand under the covert of S. Basil, as

[b] [8vo. Genev. 1632.]
[c] Apol. Athanas. ad Constant. [§ 6. tom. i. p. 298.]
[d] Vid. Baron. A.D. 553. [tom. vii. p. 434 sqq.]
[e] [vid. not. k, infra.]
[f] ['added' om. B, C.]

appears in the difference of the style, in the impertinent digressions against the custom of that excellent man, by some passages contradictory to others of S. Basil, by citing Meletius as dead before him who yet lived three years[g] after him, and by the very frame and manner of the discourse: and yet it was so handsomely carried, and so well served the purposes of men, that it was indifferently[h] quoted under the title of S. Basil by many, but without naming the number of chapters, and by S. John Damascene[i] in these words, *Basilius in opere triginta capitum de Spiritu S. ad Amphilochium;* and to the same purpose, and in the number of twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth chapters, he is cited by Photius[j], by Euthymius, by Burchard, by Zonaras, Balsamon, and Nicephorus. But for this, see more in Erasmus[k] his preface upon this book of S. Basil. There is an epistle goes still under the name of S. Hierome *ad Demetriadem virginem*, and is of great use in the question of predestination with its appendices; and yet a very learned man[l] eight hundred years agone did believe it to be written by a Pelagian, and undertakes to confute divers parts of it, as being high and confident Pelagianism, and written by Julianus, Episc. Eclanensis: but Gregorius Ariminensis[m] from S. Austin affirms it to have been written by Pelagius himself. I might instance in too many: there is not any one of the fathers who is esteemed author of any considerable number of books, that hath escaped untouched. But the abuse in this kind hath been so evident, that now if any interessed person of any side be pressed with an authority very pregnant against him, he thinks to escape by accusing the edition, or the author, or the hands it passed through, or at last he therefore suspects it because it makes against him: both sides being resolved that they are in the right, the authorities that they admit they will believe not to be against them, and they which are too plainly against them shall be no authorities. And indeed the whole world hath been so much abused, that every man thinks he hath reason to suspect whatsoever is against him, that is, what he please[n]: which proceeding only produces this truth, that there neither is nor can be any certainty, nor very much probability, in such allegations.

6. But there is a worse mischief than this, besides those very many which are not yet discovered, which like the pestilence destroys in the dark, and grows into inconvenience more insensibly and more irremediably, and that is, corruption of particular places by inserting words and altering them to contrary senses: a thing which the fathers

[g] Vid. Baron. in Annal. [A.D. 378 et 381.]

[h] ['indifferently' deest, A.]

[i] Lib. i. de imagin. orat. I. [cap. 23. tom. i. p. 318.]

[j] Nomocan., tit. i. cap. 3. [p. 5. 4to. Lutet. 1615.]

[k] [In opp. S. Basil. lat. ed. Gillot. fol. Par. 1566. p. 300.]

[l] Ven. Beda de gratia Christi adv. Julianum. [In Cantic., lib. i. tom. iv. col. 719.]

[m] Greg. Arim. in ii. sent. dist. xxvi. q. 1. a. 3. [fol. 91 b. fol. Venet. 1503.]

[n] ['pleaseth' C.]

of the sixth[n] general synod complained of concerning the Constitutions of S. Clement, *quibus jam olim ab iis qui a fide aliena sentiunt.. adulterina quædam et a pietate aliena introducta sunt, quæ divinorum nobis decretorum elegantem et venustam speciem obscurarunt.* And so also have his Recognitions, so have his epistles been used, if at least they were his at all; particularly the fifth decretal epistle that goes under the name of S. Clement, in which community of wives[o] is taught upon the authority of S. Luke, saying, the first Christians had all things common; if all things, then wives also, says the epistle: a forgery like to have been done by some Nicolaitan, or other impure person. There is an epistle of Cyril[p] extant to Successus bishop of Diocæsarea, in which he relates that he was asked by Budus[q] bishop of Emessa whether he did approve of the epistle of Athanasius to Epictetus bishop of Corinth; and that his answer was, *Si hæc apud vos scripta non sint adultera; nam plura ex his ab hostibus ecclesiæ deprehenduntur esse depravata.* And this was done even while the authors themselves were alive; for so Dionysius of Corinth[r] complained that his writings were corrupted by heretics, and pope Leo that his epistle to Flavianus was perverted by the Greeks. And in the synod of Constantinople before quoted, the sixth synod[s], Macarius and his disciples were convicted *quod sanctorum testimonia aut truncarint aut depravarint.* Thus the third chapter of S. Cyprian's book *De unitate ecclesiæ*[t] in the edition of Pamelius suffered great alteration; these words, *primatus Petro datur*, wholly inserted, and these, *super cathedram Petri fundata est ecclesia;* and whereas it was before, *super unum ædificat ecclesiam Christus*, that not being enough, they have made it *super illum unum.* Now these additions are against the faith of all old copies before Minutius and Pamelius, and against Gratian, even after himself had been chastised by the Roman correctors, the commissaries of Gregory the thirteenth; as is to be seen where these words are alleged, *Decret. caus.* xxiv. *q.* 1. *can.* '*Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum*[u].' So that we may say of Cyprian's works as Pamelius[x] himself said concerning his writings and the writings of other of the fathers, *Unde colligimus*, saith he, *Cypriani scripta ut et aliorum veterum a librariis varie fuisse interpolata.* But Gratian himself could do as fine a feat when he listed, or else somebody did it for him, and it was in this very question, their beloved article of the pope's supremacy; for *De pœnit. dist.* i. *c.* '*Potest fieri*[y],' he quotes these words out of S. Ambrose, *Non habent Petri hæreditatem qui non*

[n] Can. 2. [tom. iii. col. 1659.]

[o] [The passage referred to is given (from a MS.) in the editions of Merlin and Crabbe, but omitted by Surius and the later editors. See note in Harduin, Concil., tom. i. col. 62 A.]

[p] [Cyrill. Alex., tom. v. part. 2. append. p. 151 A.]

[q] [leg. 'Paulus.']

[r] Euseb., lib. iv. cap. 23. [p. 187.]

[s] Act. viii. [tom. iii. col. 1536.]—Vid. etiam Synod. vii. act. 4. [leg. act. 1. tom. iv. col. 63.]

[t] [p. 107 sq.]

[u] [sc. can. 18. col. 1515.]

[x] Annot. Cyprian. super Concil. Carthag. n. 1. [vid. passim, pp. 233 sqq.]

[y] [sc. c. 52. col. 1837.]

habent Petri sedem : fidem, not *sedem,* it is in S. Ambrose; but this error was made authentic by being inserted into the code of the law of the catholic church, and considering how little notice the clergy had of antiquity but what was transmitted to them by Gratian, it will be no great wonder that all this part of the world swallowed such a bole and the opinion that was wrapped in it. But I need not instance in Gratian any further, but refer any one that desires to be satisfied concerning this collection of his to Augustinus archbishop of Tarracon *in emendatione Gratiani,* where he shall find fopperies and corruptions good store noted by that learned man. But that the *Indices expurgatorii*[z] commanded by authority and practised with public license, profess to alter and correct the sayings of the fathers, and to reconcile them to the catholic sense by putting in and leaving out, is so great an imposture, so unchristian a proceeding, that it hath made the faith of all books and all authors justly to be suspected. For considering their infinite diligence, and great opportunity, as having had most of the copies in their own hands, together with an unsatisfiable desire of prevailing in their right or in their wrong, they have made an absolute destruction of this topic: and when the fathers speak Latin[a] or breathe in a Roman diocese,—although the providence of God does infinitely overrule them, and that it is next to a miracle that in the monuments of antiquity there is no more found that can pretend for their advantage than there is, which indeed is infinitely inconsiderable,—yet our questions and uncertainties are infinitely multiplied in stead of a probable and reasonable determination. For since the Latins always complained of the Greeks for privately corrupting the ancient records both of councils and fathers[b], and now the Latins make open profession not of corrupting but of correcting their writings (that's the word) and at the most it was but a human authority, and that of persons not always learned, and very often deceived; the whole matter is so unreasonable that it is not worth a further disquisition. But if any one desires to enquire further, he may be satisfied in Erasmus, in Henry and Robert Stephens, in their prefaces before the editions of fathers, and their observations upon them; in Bellarmine *De script. eccles.,* in Dr. Reynolds *De libris apocryphis,* in Scaliger, and Robert Coke of Leeds in Yorkshire, in his book *De censura patrum.*

[z] Vid. ind. expurg. Belg. [8vo. Hanov. 1611.] in Bertram. [p. 54.] et Flandr. Hispan. Portugal. Neopolitan. Romanum; Junium in præfat. ad ind. expurg. Belg. [ubi supra, p. 5 sqq.] Hasenmullerum, [Hist. Jesuit.] pag. 275. [8vo. Francof. 1605.] — Withrington. [leg. 'Widdrington,' alias Thomas Preston,] Apolog. [pro jure principum,] num. 449. [p. 342. 8vo. Cosmopoli, 1611.]

[a] Videat Lector Andream Chrastovium in Bello Jesuitico, [Pseudograph. Jesuit., p. 157 sq. 4to. 1620.] et Joh. Reynolds in lib. De idol. Rom. [e. g. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 350.]

[b] Vid. Ep. Nicolai [i.] ad Michael. Imperat. [ep. ix. Conc. Reg., tom. xxii. p. 152 sqq.]

§ 9. Of the incompetency of the church in its diffusive capacity to be judge of controversies; and the impertinency of that pretence of the Spirit.

1. AND now after all these considerations of the several topics, tradition, councils, popes and ancient doctors of the church, I suppose it will not be necessary to consider the authority of the church apart. For the church either speaks by tradition, or by a representative body in a council, by popes, or by the fathers: for the church is not a chimera, not a shadow, but a company of men believing in Jesus Christ; which men either speak by themselves immediately, or by their rulers, or by their proxies and representatives. Now I have considered it in all senses but in its diffusive capacity; in which capacity she cannot be supposed to be a judge of controversies, both because in that capacity she cannot teach us, as also because if by a judge we mean all the church diffused in all its parts and members, so there can be no controversy; for if all men be of that opinion, then there is no question contested: if they be not all of a mind, how can the whole diffusive catholic church be pretended in defiance of any one article, where the diffusive church being divided, part goes this way and part another? But if it be said the greatest part must carry it; besides that it is impossible for us to know which way the greatest part goes in many questions, it is not always true that the greater part is the best; sometimes the contrary is most certain, and it is often very probable, but it is always possible. And when paucity of followers was objected to Liberius[c], he gave this in answer, There was a time when but three children of the captivity resisted the king's decree. And Athanasius[d] wrote on purpose against those that did judge of truth by multitudes: and indeed it concerned him so to do when he alone stood in the gap against the numerous armies of the Arians.

2. But if there could in this case be any distinct consideration of the church, yet to know which is the true church is so hard to be found out, that the greatest questions of christendom are judged before you can get to your judge; and then there is no need of him: for those questions which are concerning the judge of questions must be determined before you can submit to his judgment; and if you can yourselves determine those great questions which consist much in universalities, then also you may determine the particulars as being of less difficulty. And he that considers how many notes there are given to know the true church by[e], no less than fifteen by Bellarmine[f], and concerning every one of them almost whether it be a certain note or no there are very many questions and uncertainties, and when it is resolved which are the notes, there is more dispute about the application of these notes than of the *πρωτοκρινόμενον*,—will quickly be satisfied that he had better sit still than to go round about

[c] Theodoret. hist., lib. ii. cap. 16. [al. 13. tom. iii. p. 867.]
[d] Tom. ii. [p. 261.]
[e] ['by' deest, A, B.]
[f] [In lib. de notis eccl., tom. ii. col. 203 sqq.]

a difficult and troublesome passage, and at last get no further, but return to the place from whence he first set out. And there is one note amongst the rest, holiness of doctrine, that is, so as to have nothing false either in *doctrina fidei* or *morum* (for so Bellarmine[g] explicates it) which supposes all your controversies judged before they can be tried by the authority of the church; and when we have found out all true doctrine (for that is necessary to judge of the church by, that as S. Austin's[h] counsel is, *Ecclesiam in verbis Christi investigemus*) then we are bound to follow because we judge it true, not because the church hath said it; and this is to judge of the church by her doctrine, not of the doctrine by the church. And indeed it is the best and only way: but then how to judge of that doctrine will be afterwards enquired into. In the meantime the church, that is, the governors of the churches, are to judge for themselves, and for all those who cannot judge for themselves. For others, they must know that their governors judge for them too, so as to keep them in peace and obedience, though not for the determination of their private persuasions. For the economy of the church requires that her authority be received by all her children. Now this authority is divine in its original, for it derives immediately from Christ, but it is human in its ministration. We are to be led like men, not like beasts. A rule is prescribed for the guides themselves to follow, as we are to follow the guides: and although in matters indeterminable or ambiguous the presumption lies on behalf of the governors (for we do nothing for authority if we suffer it not to weigh that part down of an indifferency and a question which she chooses) yet if there be *error manifestus*, as it often happens; or if the church governors themselves be rent into innumerable sects, as it is this day in christendom; then we are to be as wise as we can in choosing our guides, and then to follow so long as that reason remains for which we first chose them. And even in that government which was an immediate sanction of God, I mean the ecclesiastical government of the synagogue, where God had consigned the high priest's authority with a menace of death to them that should disobey,—that all the world might know the meaning and extent of such precepts, and that there is a limit beyond which they cannot command and we ought not to obey, it came once to that pass that if the priest had been obeyed in his conciliary decrees the whole nation had been bound to believe the condemnation of our blessed Saviour to have been just; and at another time the apostles must no more have preached in the name of JESUS. But here was manifest error: and the case is the same to every man that invincibly, and therefore innocently, believes it so; *Deo potius quam hominibus* is our rule in such cases. For although every man is bound to follow his guide unless he believes his guide to mislead him; yet when he sees reason against his guide, it is best to follow his reason; for

[g] [Ubi supra, cap. xi. col. 249.] [h] [De unit. eccles., tom. ix. col. 338.]

though in this he may fall into error, yet he will escape the sin; he may do violence to truth, but never to his own conscience; and an honest error is better than an hypocritical profession of truth, or a violent luxation of the understanding; since if he retains his honesty and simplicity, he cannot err in a matter of faith or absolute necessity; God's goodness hath secured all honest and careful persons from that; for other things, he must follow the best guides he can, and he cannot be obliged to follow better than God hath given him.

3. And there is yet another way pretended of infallible expositions of scripture, and that is, by the Spirit. But of this I shall say no more but that it is impertinent as to this question. For put case the Spirit is given to some men, enabling them to expound infallibly; yet because this is but a private assistance, and cannot be proved to others, this infallible assistance may determine my own assent, but shall not enable me to prescribe to others; because it were unreasonable I should, unless I could prove to him that I have the Spirit, and so can secure him from being deceived if he relies upon me. In this case I may say, as S. Paul[1] in the case of praying with the Spirit, "He verily giveth thanks well, but the other is not edified." So that let this pretence be as true as it will, it is sufficient that it cannot be of consideration in this question.

4. The result of all is this: Since it is not reasonable to limit and prescribe to all men's understandings by any external rule in the interpretation of difficult places of scripture, which is our rule; since no man nor company of men is secure from error, or can secure us that they are free from malice, interest, and design; and since all the ways by which we usually are taught, as tradition, councils, decretals, &c., are very uncertain in the matter, in their authority, in their being legitimate and natural, and many of them certainly false, and nothing certain but the divine authority of scripture, in which all that is necessary is plain, and much of that that is not necessary, is very obscure, intricate, and involved: either we must set up our rest only upon articles of faith and plain places, and be incurious of other obscurer revelations (which is a duty for persons of private understandings and of no public function) or if we will search further (to which in some measure the guides of others are obliged) it remains we enquire how men may determine themselves so as to do their duty to God and not to disserve the church, that every such man may do what he is bound to in his personal capacity, and as he relates to the public as a public minister.

§ 10. Of the authority of reason; and that it, proceeding upon best grounds, is the best judge.

1. HERE then I consider, that although no man may be trusted to judge for all others, unless this person were infallible and authorized so to do, which no man nor no company of men is; yet every man may be trusted to judge for himself, I say, every man

[1] [1 Cor. xiv. 17.]

that can judge at all; as for others, they are to be saved as it pleaseth God: but others that can judge at all must either choose their guides who shall judge for them, and then they oftentimes do the wisest, and always save themselves a labour, but then they choose too; or if they be persons of greater understanding, then they are to choose for themselves in particular what the others do in general, and by choosing their guide: and for this any man may be better trusted for himself than any man can be for another. For in this case his own interest is most concerned; and ability is not so necessary as honesty, which certainly every man will best preserve in his own case, and to himself, and if he does not it is he that must smart for't; and it is not required of us not to be in error, but that we endeavour to avoid it.

2. He that follows his guide so far as his reason goes along with him, or, which is all one, he that follows his own reason (not guided only by natural arguments but by divine revelation and all other good means) hath great advantages over him that gives himself wholly to follow any human guide whatsoever, because he follows all their reasons and his own too: he follows them till reason leaves them, or till it seems so to him, which is all one to his particular; for by the confession of all sides an erroneous conscience[1] binds him when a right guide does not bind him. But he that gives himself up wholly to a guide is oftentimes (I mean if he be a discerning person) forced to do violence to his own understanding, and to lose all the benefit of his own discretion, that he may reconcile his reason to his guide. And of this we see infinite inconveniences in the church of Rome: for we find persons of great understanding oftentimes so amused with the authority of their church, that it is pity to see them sweat in answering some objections, which they know not how to do, but yet believe they must, because the church hath said it. So that if they read, study, pray, search records, and use all the means of art and industry, in the pursuit of truth, it is not with a resolution to follow that which shall seem truth to them, but to confirm what before they did believe: and if any argument shall seem unanswerable against any article of their church, they are to take it for a temptation, not for an illumination, and they are to use it accordingly; which makes them make the devil to be the author of that which God's spirit hath assisted them to find in the use of lawful means and the search of truth. And when the devil of falsehood is like to be cast out by God's spirit, they say that it is through Beelzebub: which was one of the worst things that ever the pharisees said or did. And was it not a plain stifling of the just and reasonable demands made by the emperor, by the kings of France and Spain, and by the ablest divines among them, which was used in the council of Trent, when they demanded the restitution of priests to their liberty of marriage, the use of the chalice, the service in the vulgar tongue; and these things

[1] [See 'Ductor. dubit.,' bk. i. ch. 3. rule 2.]

not only in pursuance of truth, but for other great and good ends, even to take away an infinite scandal and a great schism? and yet when they themselves did profess it, and all the world knew these reasonable demands were denied merely upon a politic consideration, yet that these things should be framed into articles and decrees of faith, and they for ever after bound, not only not to desire the same things, but to think the contrary to be divine truths; never was reason made more a slave or more useless. Must not all the world say, either they must be great hypocrites, or do great violence to their understanding, when they not only cease from their claim, but must also believe it to be unjust? If the use of their reason had not been restrained by the tyranny and imperiousness of their guide, what the emperor and the kings and their theologues would have done, they can best judge who consider the reasonableness of the demand and the unreasonableness of the denial. But we see many wise men who with their *Optandum esset ut ecclesia licentiam daret, &c.*, proclaim to all the world that in some things they consent and do not consent, and do not heartily believe what they are bound publicly to profess; and they themselves would clearly see a difference if a contrary decree should be framed by the church, they would with an infinite greater confidence rest themselves in other propositions than what they must believe as the case now stands; and they would find that the authority of a church is a prejudice as often as a free and modest use of reason is a temptation.

3. God will have no man pressed with another's inconveniences in matters spiritual and intellectual, no man's salvation to depend upon another: and every tooth that eats sour grapes shall be set on edge for itself, and for none else; and this is remarkable in that saying of God by the prophet[k], "If the prophet ceases to tell My people of their sins and leads them into error, the people shall die in their sins, and the blood of them I will require at the hands of that prophet;" meaning, that God hath so set the prophets to guide us that we also are to follow them by a voluntary assent, by an act of choice and election. For although accidentally and occasionally the sheep may perish by the shepherd's fault, yet that which hath the chiefest influence upon their final condition is their own act and election: and therefore God hath so appointed guides to us that if we perish it may be accounted upon both our scores, upon our own and the guides' too; which says plainly that although we are intrusted to our guides, yet we are intrusted to ourselves too. Our guides must direct us; and yet if they fail, God hath not so left us to them but He hath given us enough to ourselves to discover their failings and our own duties in all things necessary. And for other things, we must do as well as we can. But it is best to follow our guides, if we know nothing better: but if we do, it is better to follow the pillar of fire than a pillar of cloud, though both possibly may lead to Canaan, but

[k] Ezek. xxxiii. [6.]

then also it is possible that it may be otherwise. But I am sure if I do my own best, then if it be best to follow a guide, and if it be also necessary, I shall be sure by God's grace and my own endeavour to get to it: but if I without the particular engagement of my own understanding follow a guide, possibly I may be guilty of extreme negligence; or I may extinguish God's spirit; or do violence to my own reason. And whether intrusting myself wholly with another be not a laying up my talent in a napkin, I am not so well assured: I am certain the other is not. And since another man's answering for me will not hinder but that I also shall answer for myself, as it concerns him to see he does not wilfully misguide me, so it concerns me to see that he shall not if I can help it; if I cannot, it will not be required at my hands; whether it be his fault or his invincible error, I shall be charged with neither.

4. This is no other than what is enjoined as a duty. For since God will be justified with a free obedience, and there is an obedience of understanding as well as of will and affection, it is of great concernment, as to be willing to believe whatever God says, so also to enquire diligently whether the will of God be so as is pretended. Even our acts of understanding are acts of choice: and therefore it is commanded as a duty to 'search the scriptures;' to 'try the spirits whether they be of God or no;' 'of ourselves to be able to judge what is right;' to 'try all things,' and to 'retain that which is best[l].' For he that resolves not to consider, resolves not to be careful whether he have truth or no; and therefore hath an affection indifferent to truth or falsehood, which is all one as if he did choose amiss: and since when things are truly propounded and made reasonable and intelligible, we cannot but assent, and then it is no thanks to us; we have no way to give our wills to God in matters of belief but by our industry in searching it, and examining the grounds upon which the propounders build their dictates. And the not doing it is oftentimes a cause that God gives a man over εἰς νοῦν ἀδόκιμον, 'into a reprobate and undiscerning mind and understanding.'

5. And this very thing (though men will not understand it) is the perpetual practice of all men in the world that can give a reasonable account of their faith. The very catholic church itself is *rationabilis et ubique diffusa*, saith Optatus[m]; 'reasonable' as well as 'diffused everywhere.' For take the proselytes of the church of Rome, even in their greatest submission of understanding they seem to themselves to follow their reason most of all. For if you tell them scripture and tradition are their rules to follow, they will believe you when they know a reason for it; and if they take you upon your word, they have a reason for that too: either they believe you a learned man, or a good man, or that you can have no ends upon

[l] Matt. xv. 10; John v. 39; 1 John iv. 1; Eph. v. 17; Luke xxiv. 25; Rom. i. 28; iii. 11; Apoc. ii. 2; Acts xvii. 11.

[m] Lib. iii. [leg. lib. ii. cap. 1, p. 29.]

them, or something that is of an equal height to fit their understandings. If you tell them they must believe the church, you must tell them why they are bound to it; and if you quote scripture to prove it, you must give them leave to judge whether the words alleged speak your sense or no, and therefore to dissent if they say no such thing. And although all men are not wise and proceed discreetly, yet all make their choice some way or other; he that chooses to please his fancy, takes his choice as much as he that chooses prudently; and no man speaks more unreasonably than he that denies to men the use of their reason in choice of their religion. For that I may by the way remove the common prejudice, reason and authority are not things incompetent or repugnant, especially when the authority is infallible and supreme, for there is no greater reason in the world than to believe such an authority. But then we must consider whether every authority that pretends to be such, is so indeed. And therefore *Deus dixit, ergo hoc verum est*, is the greatest demonstration in the world for things of this nature. But it is not so in human dictates, and yet reason and human authority are not enemies. For it is a good argument for us to follow such an opinion, because it is made sacred by the authority of councils and ecclesiastical tradition, and sometimes it is the best reason we have in a question, and then it is to be strictly followed: but there may also be, at other times, a reason greater than it that speaks against it, and then the authority must not carry it. But then the difference is not between reason and authority, but between this reason and that, which is greater: for authority is a very good reason, and is to prevail, unless a stronger comes and disarms it, but then it must give place. So that in this question, by 'reason' I do not mean a distinct topic, but a transcendent that runs through all topics: for reason, like logic, is instrument of all things else; and when revelation, and philosophy, and public experience, and all other grounds of probability or demonstration, have supplied us with matter, then reason does but make use of them: that is in plain terms, there being so many ways of arguing, so many sects, such differing interests, such variety of authority, so many pretences, and so many false beliefs, it concerns every wise man to consider which is the best argument, which proposition relies upon the truest grounds. And if this were not his only way, why do men dispute and urge arguments? why do they cite councils and fathers? why do they allege scripture and tradition, and all this on all sides, and to contrary purposes? If we must judge, then we must use our reason; if we must not judge, why do they produce evidence? Let them leave disputing, and decree propositions magisterially; but then we may choose whether we will believe them or no: or if they say we must believe them, they must prove it, and tell us why. And all these disputes concerning tradition, councils, fathers, &c., are not arguments against or besides reason, but contestations and pre-

tences to the best arguments, and the most certain satisfaction of our reason. But then all these coming into question submit themselves to reason, that is, to be judged by human understanding upon the best grounds and information it can receive. So that scripture, tradition, councils, and fathers, are the evidence in a question, but reason is the judge: that is, we being the persons that are to be persuaded, we must see that we be persuaded reasonably: and it is unreasonable to assent to a lesser evidence, when a greater and clearer is propounded. But of that every man for himself is to take cognizance, if he be able to judge: if he be not, he is not bound under the tie of necessity to know any thing of it: that that is necessary shall be certainly conveyed to him, God that best can will certainly take care for that; for if He does not, it becomes to be not necessary; or if it should still remain necessary, and he damned for not knowing it, and yet to know it be not in his power, then who can help it? there can be no further care in this business. In other things, there being no absolute and prime necessity, we are left to our liberty to judge that way that makes best demonstration of our piety and of our love to God and truth, not that way that is always the best argument of an excellent understanding; for this may be a blessing, but the other only is a duty.

6. And now that we are pitched upon that way which is most natural and reasonable in determination of ourselves, rather than of questions, which are often indeterminable, since right reason proceeding upon the best grounds it can, viz., of divine revelation and human authority and probability, is our guide, *stando in humanis;* and supposing the assistance of God's spirit, which He never denies them that fail not of their duty in all such things in which He requires truth and certainty; it remains that we consider how it comes to pass that men are so much deceived in the use of their reason and choice of their religion, and that in this account we distinguish those accidents which make error innocent from those which make it become a heresy.

§ 11. Of some causes of error in the exercise of reason, which are inculpate in themselves.

1. THEN I consider that there are a great many inculpable causes of error, which are arguments of human imperfections, not convictions of a sin. That first, the variety of human understandings is so great that what is plain and apparent to one is difficult and obscure to another; one will observe a consequent from a common principle, and another from thence will conclude the quite contrary. When S. Peter saw the vision of the sheet let down with all sorts of beasts in it, and a voice saying *Surge Petre, macta et manduca*, if he had not by a particular assistance been directed to the meaning of the Holy Ghost, possibly he might have had other apprehensions of the meaning of that vision; for to myself it seems naturally to speak nothing but the abolition of the Mosaical rites, and the restitution of

us to that part of christian liberty which consists in the promiscuous eating of meats: and yet besides this, there want not some understandings in the world to whom these words seem to give S. Peter a power to kill heretical princes. Methinks it is a strange understanding that makes such extractions; but Bozius[n] and Baronius[o] did so. But men may understand what they please, especially when they are to expound oracles. It was an argument of some wit, but of singularity of understanding, that happened in the great contestation between the missals of S. Ambrose and S. Gregory[p]. The lot was thrown, and God made to be judge, so as He was tempted to a miracle to answer a question which themselves might have ended without much trouble. The two missals were laid upon the altar, and the church door shut and sealed. By the morrow matins they found S. Gregory's missal torn in pieces (saith the story) and thrown about the church, but S. Ambrose's opened and laid upon the altar in a posture of being read. If I had been to judge of the meaning of this miracle, I should have made no scruple to have said it had been the will of God that the missal of S. Ambrose, which had been anciently used and publicly tried and approved of, should still be read in the church; and that of Gregory let alone, it being torn by an angelical hand as an argument of its imperfection or of the inconvenience of innovation. But yet they judged it otherwise; for by the tearing and scattering about, they thought it was meant it should be used over all the world, and that of S. Ambrose read only in the church of Milan. I am more satisfied that the former was the true meaning than I am of the truth of the story: but we must suppose that. And now there might have been eternal disputings about the meaning of the miracle, and nothing left to determine, when two fancies are the litigants, and the contestations about probabilities *hinc inde*. And I doubt not this was one cause of so great variety of opinions in the primitive church, when they proved their several opinions which were mysterious questions of christian theology, by testimonies out of the obscurer prophets, out of the Psalms and Canticles; as who please to observe their arguments of discourse and actions of council, shall perceive they very much used to do. Now although men's understandings be not equal, and that it is fit the best understandings should prevail; yet that will not satisfy the weaker understandings, because all men will not think that another understanding is better than his own, at least not in such a particular in which with fancy he hath pleased himself. But commonly they that are least able are most bold, and the more ignorant is the more confident; therefore it is but reason, if he would have another bear with him, he also should bear with another; and if he will not be

[n] [? 'Bzovius.'—And see p. 508 infra.]

[o] [The reference is to his 'Votum contra remp. Venetam' 4to. 1606. See Taylor's sermon on Nov. 5.]

[p] [Durand. ration., lib. v. cap. 2.— But for other versions of the story, from Beroldus and Galvaneus, see 'Vicecomes de Missæ ritibus,' lib. ii. cap. 18, ad calc. 'Observ. eccles.' p. 196 sqq. 4to. Mediol. 1618.]

prescribed to, neither let him prescribe to others. And there is the more reason in this because such modesty is commonly to be desired of the more imperfect: for wise men know the ground of their persuasions, and have their confidence proportionable to their evidence; others have not, but overact their trifles. And therefore I said it is but a reasonable demand that they that have the least reason should not be most imperious: and for others, it being reasonable enough, for all their great advantages upon other men, they will be soon persuaded to it. For although wise men might be bolder in respect of the persons of others less discerning; yet they know there are but few things so certain as to create much boldness and confidence of assertion. If they do not, they are not the men I take them for.

2. Secondly, when an action or opinion is commenced with zeal and piety against a known vice or a vicious person, commonly all the mistakes of its proceeding are made sacred by[q] the holiness of the[q] principle, and so abuses the persuasions of good people that they make it as a characteristic note to distinguish good persons from bad: and then whatever error is consecrated by this means, is therefore made the more lasting because it is accounted holy, and the persons are not easily accounted heretics because they erred upon a pious principle. There is a memorable instance in one of the greatest questions of christendom, viz. concerning images. For when Philippicus[r] had espied the images of the six first synods upon the front of a church, he caused them to be pulled down; now he did it in hatred of the sixth synod, for he being a Monothelite stood condemned by that synod. The catholics that were zealous for the sixth synod caused the images and representments to be put up again; and then sprung the question concerning the lawfulness of images in churches. Philippicus and his party strived by suppressing images to do disparagement to the sixth synod; the catholics, to preserve the honour of the sixth synod, would uphold images. And then the question came to be changed, and they who were easy enough to be persuaded to pull down images were overawed by a prejudice against the Monothelites, and the Monothelites strived to maintain the advantage they had got by a just and pious pretence against images. The Monothelites would have secured their error by the advantage and consociation of a truth; and the other would rather defend a dubious and disputable error than lose and let go a certain truth. And thus the case stood, and the successors of both parts were led invincibly. For when the heresy of the Monothelites disbanded (which it did in a while after) yet the opinion of the Iconoclasts and the question of images grew stronger: yet since the Iconoclasts at the first were heretics, not for their breaking images, but for denying the two wills of Christ, His divine and His human; that they were called Iconoclasts was to distinguish their opinion in the question concerning the

[q] ['to,' 'its,' B.]

[r] Vid. Paulum Diaconum. [Hist. miscell., lib. xx. in Murator. Rer. Ital. scriptt., tom. i. p. 145.]

images; but that then Iconoclasts so easily had the reputation of heretics was because of the other opinion, which was conjunct in their persons; which opinion men afterwards did not easily distinguish in them, but took them for heretics in gross, and whatsoever they held to be heretical. And thus upon this prejudice grew great advantages to the veneration of images, and the persons at first were much to be excused because they were misguided by that which might have abused the best men. And if Epiphanius, who was as zealous against images in churches as Philippicus or Leo Isaurus, had but begun a public contestation, and engaged emperors to have made decrees against them, christendom would have had other apprehensions of it than they had when the Monothelites began it. For few men will endure a truth from the mouth of the devil; and if the person be suspected, so are his ways too. And it is a great subtilty of the devil, so to temper truth and falsehood in the same person, that truth may lose much of its reputation by its mixture with error, and the error may become more plausible by reason of its conjunction with truth. And this we see by too much experience, for we see many truths are blasted in their reputation because persons whom we think we hate upon just grounds of religion have taught them. And it was plain enough in the case of Maldonat[s], that said of an explication of a place of scripture that it was most agreeable to antiquity, but because Calvin had so expounded it, he therefore chose a new one. This was malice. But when a prejudice works tacitly, undiscernibly, and irresistibly of the person so wrought upon, the man is to be pitied, not condemned, though possibly his opinion deserves it highly. And therefore it hath been usual to discredit doctrines by the personal defailances of them that preach them, or with the disreputation of that sect that maintains them in conjunction with other perverse doctrines. Faustus the Manichee in S. Austin[t] glories much that in their religion God was worshipped purely and without images. S. Austin liked it well, for so it was in his too; but from hence Sanders[u] concludes that to pull down images in churches was the heresy of the Manichees. The Jews endure no images, therefore Bellarmine[v] makes it to be a piece of Judaism to oppose them; he might as well have concluded against saying our prayers and church-music that it is Judaical because the Jews used it. And he would be loth to be served so himself; for he that had a mind to use such arguments might with much better probability conclude against their sacrament of extreme unction, because when the miraculous healing was ceased, then they were not catholics but heretics that did transfer it to the use of dying persons, says Irenæus[x]; for so did the Valentinians. And indeed this argument is something better than I

[s] In cap. vi. Johan. [?]
[t] Lib. xx. c. 3. Cont. Faustum Man. [tom. viii. col. 338.]
[u] Lib. i. c. ult. de Imagin. [p. 89 sqq.]
[v] De reliq. SS., l. ii. c. 6. sect. 'Nicolaus.' [tom. ii. col. 947.]
[x] Lib. i. c. 8. adv. hær. [leg. cap. 18. al. 21. § 5. p. 97.]

thought for at first, because it was in Irenæus's time reckoned amongst the heresies. But there are a sort of men that are even with them, and hate some good things which the church of Rome teaches, because she who teaches so many errors hath been the publisher and is the practiser of those things. I confess the thing is always unreasonable, but sometimes it is invincible and innocent, and then may serve to abate the fury of all such decretory sentences as condemn all the world but their own disciples.

3. Thirdly, there are some opinions that have gone hand in hand with a blessing and a prosperous profession; and the good success of their defenders hath amused many good people, because they thought they heard God's voice where they saw God's hand, and therefore have rushed upon such opinions with great piety and as great mistaking. For where they once had entertained a fear of God and apprehension of His so sensible declaration, such a fear produces scruple, and a scrupulous conscience is always to be pitied, because though it is seldom wise it is always pious. And this very thing hath prevailed so far upon the understandings even of wise men, that Bellarmine makes it a note of the true church. Which opinion when it prevails is a ready way to make that instead of martyrs, all men should prove heretics or apostates in persecution; for since men in misery are very suspicious, out of strong desires to find out the cause, that by removing it they may be relieved, they apprehend that to be it that is first presented to their fears; and then if ever truth be afflicted, she shall also be destroyed. I will say nothing in defiance of this fancy, although all the experience in the world says it is false, and that of all men Christians should least believe it to be true, to whom a perpetual cross is their certain expectation, (and the argument is like the moon, for which no garment can be fit, it alters according to the success of human affairs, and in one age will serve a papist, and in another a protestant:) yet when such an opinion does prevail upon timorous persons, the malignity of their error (if any be consequent to this fancy, and taken up upon the reputation of a prosperous heresy) is not to be considered simply and nakedly, but abatement is to be made in a just proportion to that fear, and to that apprehension.

4. Fourthly, education is so great and so invincible a prejudice, that he who masters the inconvenience of it is more to be commended, than he can justly be blamed that complies with it. For men do not always call them principles which are the prime fountains of reason, from whence such consequents naturally flow as are to guide the actions and discourses of men; but they are principles which they are first taught, which they sucked in next to their milk, and by a proportion to those first principles they usually take their estimate of propositions. For whatsoever is taught to them at first they believe infinitely, for they know nothing to the contrary, they have had no other masters whose theorems might abate the strength of their first

persuasions; and it is a great advantage in those cases to get possession; and before their first principles can be dislodged they are made habitual and complexional, it is in their nature then to believe them; and this is helped forward very much by the advantage of love and veneration which we have to the first parents of our persuasions. And we see it in the orders of regulars in the church of Rome: that opinion which was the opinion of their patron or founder, or of some eminent personage of the institute, is enough to engage all the order to be of that opinion: and it is strange that all the Dominicans should be of one opinion in the matter of predetermination and immaculate conception, and all the Franciscans of the quite contrary, as if their understandings were formed in a different mould, and furnished with various principles by their very rule. Now this prejudice works by many principles; but how strongly they do possess the understanding is visible in that great instance of the affection and perfect persuasion the weaker sort of people have to that which they call the religion of their forefathers[7]. You may as well charm a fever asleep with the noise of bells, as make any pretence of reason against that religion which old men have entailed upon their heirs male so many generations till they can prescribe. And the apostles found this to be most true in the extremest difficulty they met with, to contest against the rites of Moses, and the long superstition of the gentiles, which they therefore thought fit to be retained because they had done so formerly, *Pergentes non quo eundum est sed quo itur:* and all the blessings of this life which God gave them they had in conjunction with their religion, and therefore they believed it was for their religion; and this persuasion was bound fast in them with ribs of iron: the apostles were forced to unloose the whole conjuncture of parts and principles in their understandings before they could make them malleable and receptive of any impresses. But the observation and experience of all wise men can justify this truth. All that I shall say to the present purpose is this, that consideration is to be had to the weakness of persons when they are prevailed upon by so innocent a prejudice; and when there cannot be arguments strong enough to overmaster an habitual persuasion bred with a man, nourished up with him, that always eat at his table, and lay in his bosom, he is not easily to be called heretic; for if he keeps the foundation of faith, other articles are not so clearly demonstrated on either side but that a man may innocently be abused to the contrary: and therefore in this case to handle him charitably is but to do him justice. And when an opinion *in minoribus articulis* is entertained upon the title and stock of education, it may be the better permitted to him, since upon no better stock nor stronger arguments most men entertain their whole religion, even christianity itself.

[7] Optima rati ea quæ magno assensu recepta sunt, quorumque exempla multa sunt; nec ad rationem sed ad similitudinem vivimus.—Sen.—Vid. Min. Fel. Octav. [e. g. cap. vi. init.]

5. Fifthly, there are some persons of a differing persuasion who therefore are the rather to be tolerated, because the indirect practices and impostures of their adversaries have confirmed them that those opinions which they disavow are not from God, as being upheld by means not of God's appointment. For it is no unreasonable discourse to say that God will not be served with a lie, for He does not need one, and He hath means enough to support all those truths which He hath commanded, and hath supplied every honest cause with enough for its maintenance and to contest against its adversaries. And (but that they which use indirect arts will not be willing to lose any of their unjust advantages, nor yet be charitable to those persons whom either to gain or to undo they leave nothing unattempted) the church of Rome hath much reason not to be so decretory in her sentences against persons of a differing persuasion: for if their cause were entirely the cause of God, they have given wise people reason to suspect it, because some of them have gone to the devil to defend it. And if it be remembered what tragedies were stirred up against Luther for saying the devil had taught him an argument against the mass, it will be of as great advantage against them that they go to the devil for many arguments to support not only the mass but the other distinguishing articles of their church. I instance in the notorious forging of miracles, and framing of false and ridiculous legends. For the former I need no other instances than what happened in the great contestation about the immaculate conception, when there were miracles brought on both sides to prove the contradictory parts; and though it be more than probable that both sides played the jugglers, yet the Dominicans had the ill luck to be discovered, and the actors burnt at Berne. But this discovery happened by providence; for the Dominican opinion hath more degrees of probability than the Franciscan; is clearly more consonant both to scripture and all antiquity; and this part of it is acknowledged by the greatest patrons themselves, as[a] Salmeron, Posa, and Wadding: yet because they played the knaves in a just question, and used false arts to maintain a true proposition, God almighty, to shew that He will not be served by a lie, was pleased rather to discover the imposture in the right opinion than in the false, since nothing is more dishonourable to God than to offer a sin in sacrifice to Him, and nothing more incongruous in the nature of the thing than that truth and falsehood should support each other, or that true doctrine should live at the charges of a lie. And he that considers the arguments for each opinion will easily conclude that if God would not have truth confirmed by a lie, much less would He himself attest a lie with a true miracle. And by this ground it will easily follow that the Franciscan party, although they had better luck than the Dominicans, yet had not more honesty, because their cause was worse, and therefore their arguments no whit the better. And although

[a] [vid. p. 486 supra.]

the argument drawn from miracles is good to attest a holy doctrine, which by its own worth will support itself after way is a little made by miracles; yet of itself and by its own reputation it will not support any fabric: for instead of proving a doctrine to be true, it makes that the miracles themselves are suspected to be illusions, if they be pretended in behalf of a doctrine which we think we have reason to account false. And therefore the Jews did not believe Christ's doctrine for His miracles, but disbelieved the truth of His miracles because they did not like His doctrine. And if the holiness of His doctrine, and the Spirit of God by inspirations and infusions, and by that which S. Peter[a] calls "a surer word of prophecy," had not attested the divinity both of His person and His office, we should have wanted many degrees of confidence which now we have upon the truth of christian religion. But now since we are foretold by this "surer word of prophecy," that is, the prediction of Jesus Christ, that antichrist should come in all wonders and signs and lying miracles, and that the church saw much of that already verified in Simon Magus[b], Apollonius Tyaneus[c], and Manetho[d], and divers[e] heretics, it is now come to that pass that the argument in its best advantage proves nothing so much as that the doctrine which it pretends to prove is to be suspected; because it was foretold that false doctrine should be obtruded under such pretences. But then when not only true miracles are an insufficient argument to prove a truth since the establishment of christianity, but that the miracles themselves are false and spurious, it makes that doctrine in whose defence they come, justly to be suspected; because they are a demonstration that the interested persons use all means, leave nothing unattempted, to prove their propositions; but since they so fail as to bring nothing from God, but something from the devil, for its justification, it's a great sign that the doctrine is false, because we know the devil, unless it be against his will, does nothing to prove a true proposition that makes against him. And now then those persons who will endure no man of another opinion, might do well to remember how by their exorcisms, their devils' tricks at Loudun[f], and the other side pretending to cure mad folks and persons bewitched, and the many discoveries of their juggling, they have given so much reason to their adversaries to suspect their doctrine, that either they must not be ready to condemn their persons who are made suspicious by their indirect proceeding in attestation of that which they value so high as to call their religion, or else they must condemn themselves for making the scandal active and effectual.

[a] [2 Pet. i. 19.]

[b] Vid. Baron. A.D. lxviii. n. 22. [tom. i. p. 651.]

[c] Philostr., lib. iv. p. 485. [al. p. 158 sqq.]

[d] Compend. Ced. [i. e. Cedreni,] p. 202. [al. 194 sq.]

[e] Stapleton Prompt. Moral. pars æstiva, p. 627. [al. 536, tom. iv. scil. in domin. xxiv. post Pentecost. § 4.]

[f] [See the life of Urban Grandier, in Bayle's Dictionary.]

6. As for false legends, it will be of the same consideration, because they are false testimonies of miracles that were never done, which differs only from the other as a lie in words from a lie in action; but of this we have witness enough in that decree of pope Leo X., session the eleventh of the last Lateran council[g], where he excommunicates all the forgers and inventors of visions and false miracles; which is a testimony that it was then a practice so public as to need a law for its suppression. And if any man shall doubt whether it were so or not, let him see the *Centum gravamina* of the princes of Germany[h], where it is highly complained of. But the extreme stupidity and sottishness of the inventors of lying stories is so great as to give occasion to some persons to suspect the truth of all church story[i]: witness the legend of Lombardy: of the author of which the bishop of Canaries[k] gives this testimony, *In illo enim libro miraculorum monstra sæpius quam vera miracula legas: hanc homo scripsit ferrei oris, plumbei cordis, animi certe parum severi et prudentis.* But I need not descend so low, for S. Gregory and Ven. Bede themselves reported miracles for the authority of which they only had the report of the common people: and it is not certain that S. Hierome had so much in his stories of S. Paul and S. Anthony[l], and the fauns and the satyrs which appeared to them and desired their prayers. But I shall only by way of eminency note what sir Thomas More[m] says in his epistle to Ruthal the king's secretary, before the dialogue of Lucian *Philopseudes*, that therefore he undertook the translation of that dialogue, to free the world from a superstition that crept in under the face and title of religion. For such lies, says he, are transmitted to us with such authority, that a certain impostor had persuaded S. Austin that the very fable[n] which Lucian scoffs and makes sport withal in that dialogue was a real story, and acted in his own days. The epistle is worth the reading to this purpose; but he says this abuse grew to such a height that scarce any life of any saint or martyr is truly related, but is full of lies and lying wonders; and some persons thought they served God if they did honour to God's saints by inventing some prodigious story or miracle for their reputation. So that now it is no wonder if the most pious men are apt to believe, and the greatest historians are easy enough to report, such stories which serving to a good end, are also consigned by the report of persons otherwise pious and prudent enough. I will not instance in Vincentius his *speculum*, Turo-

[g] [tom. ix. col. 1806 sq.]

[h] [Apud Goldast. Constitt. imperial. tom. i. p. 456 sqq.]

[i] Τὰ γὰρ μὴ εἰρημένα ἐκβιαζόμενοι, καὶ τὰ ἀβιάστως εἰρημένα ὑποπτεύεσθαι παρασκευάζουσιν.—Isid. Pelus.

[k] [Melchior Canus.] vid. lib. xi. loc. theol. cap. 6. [p. 540. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1605.]

[l] Canus, ibid. [p. 535.]

[m] [p. 31 b. opp. fol. Lovan. 1566.]

[n] Viz. De duobus spuriis, altero decedente, altero in vitam redeunte post viginti dies; quam in aliis nominibus ridet Lucianus. Vide etiam argumentum Gilberti Cognati, in annotat. in hunc dialog. [p. 52, ad calc. opp. Lucian. fol. Par. 1615.]

nensis, Thomas Cantipratanus, John Herolt, *Vitæ Patrum*, nor the revelations of S. Bridget[o], though confirmed by two popes, Martin the fifth and Boniface the ninth; even the best and most deliberate amongst them, Lippoman, Surius, Lipsius, Bzovius, and Baronius, are so full of fables, that they cause great disreputation to the other monuments and records of antiquity, and yet do no advantage to the cause under which they serve and take pay. They do no good, and much hurt; but yet accidentally they may procure this advantage to charity, since they do none to faith; that since they have so abused the credit of story that our confidences want much of that support we should receive from her records of antiquity, yet the men that dissent and are scandalized by such proceedings should be excused if they should chance to be afraid of truth, that hath put on garments of imposture; and since much violence is done to the truth and certainty of their judging, let none be done to their liberty of judging; since they cannot meet a right guide, let them have a charitable judge. And since it is one very great argument against Simon Magus and against Mahomet that we can prove their miracles to be impostures, it is much to be pitied if timorous and suspicious persons shall invincibly and honestly less apprehend a truth which they see conveyed by such a testimony which we all use as an argument to reprove the Mahometan superstition.

7. Sixthly, here also comes in all the weaknesses and trifling prejudices which operate not by their own strength, but by advantage taken from the weakness of some understandings. Some men by a proverb or a common saying are determined to the belief of a proposition for which they have no argument better than such a proverbial sentence. And when divers of the common people in Jerusalem[p] were ready to yield their understandings to the belief of the Messias, they were turned clearly from their apprehensions by that proverb, 'Look and see, does any good thing come from Galilee?' and this, 'When Christ comes, no man knows from whence He is;' but this man was known of what parents, of what city: and thus the weakness of their understanding was abused, and that made the argument too hard for them. And the whole seventh chapter of S. John's gospel is a perpetual instance of the efficacy of such trifling prejudices, and the vanity and weakness of popular understandings. Some whole ages have been abused by a definition, which being once received, as most commonly they are upon slight grounds, they are taken for certainties in any science respectively, and for principles; and upon their reputation men use to frame conclusions which must be false or uncertain according as the definitions are. And he that hath observed any thing of the weaknesses of men, and the successions of groundless doctrines from age to age, and how seldom definitions which are put into systems or that derive from the fathers or

[o] Vid. Palæot. de sacra sindone, par. 1. epist. ad lector. [ed. fol. Ven. 1606.]
[p] [vid. John i. 46; vii. 52 and 27.]

are approved among schoolmen, are examined by persons of the same interests, will bear me witness how many and great inconveniences press hard upon the persuasions of men, who are abused and yet never consider who hurt them. Others, and they very many, are led by authority or examples of princes and great personages; *Numquis credit ex principibus*[q]*?* Some by the reputation of one learned man are carried into any persuasion whatsoever. And in the middle and latter ages of the church this was the more considerable, because the infinite ignorance of the clerks and the men of the long robe gave them over to be led by those few guides which were marked to them by an eminency much more than their ordinary; which also did the more amuse them because most commonly they were fit for nothing but to admire what they understood not. Their learning then was some skill in the Master of the Sentences, in Aquinas or Scotus, whom they admired next to the most intelligent order of angels: hence came opinions that made sects and division of names, Thomists, Scotists, Albertists, Nominals, Reals, and I know not what monsters of names; and whole families of the same opinion, the whole institute of an order being engaged to believe according to the opinion of some leading man of the same order, as if such an opinion were imposed upon them *in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ.* But this inconvenience is greater when the principle of the mistake runs higher, when the opinion is derived from a primitive man and a saint; for then it often happens that what at first was but a plain innocent seduction, comes to be made sacred by the veneration which is consequent to the person for having lived long agone; and then because the person is also since canonized, the error is almost made eternal and the cure desperate. These and the like prejudices, which are as various as the miseries of humanity or the variety of human understandings, are not absolute excuses unless to some persons: but truly if they be to any, they are exemptions to all from being pressed with too peremptory a sentence against them; especially if we consider what leave is given to all men by the church of Rome to follow any one probable doctor in an opinion which is contested against by many more. And as for the doctors of the other side, they being destitute of any pretences to an infallible medium to determine questions, must of necessity allow the same liberty to the people, to be as prudent as they can in the choice of a fallible guide; and when they have chosen, if they do follow him into error, the matter is not so inexpiable for being deceived in using the best guides we had, which guides because themselves were abused did also against their wills deceive me. So that this prejudice may the easier abuse us, because it is almost like a duty to follow the dictates of a probable doctor: or if it be overacted, or accidentally pass into an inconvenience, it is therefore to be excused because the principle was not ill, unless we judge by our event, not by the antecedent probability. Of such men

[q] John vii. [48.]

as these it was said by S. Austin[r], *Cæteram turbam non intelligendi vivacitas sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit.* And Gregory Nazianzen[s], Σώζει πολλάκις τὸν λαὸν τὸ ἀβασάνιστον. The common sort of people are safe in their not enquiring by their own industry, and in the simplicity of their understanding relying upon the best guides they can get.

8. But this is of such a nature in which as we may inculpably be deceived, so we may turn it into a vice or a design; and then the consequent errors will alter the property, and become heresies. There are some men, that 'have men's persons in admiration because of advantage,' and some that have 'itching ears,' and 'heap up teachers to themselves.' In these and the like cases the authority of a person and the prejudices of a great reputation, is not the excuse but the fault; and a sin is so far from excusing an error, that error becomes a sin by reason of its relation to that sin as to its parent and principle.

§ 12. Of the innocency of error in opinion in a pious person.

1. And therefore as there are so many innocent causes of error as there are weaknesses within, and harmless and unavoidable prejudices from without; so if ever error be procured by a vice, it hath no excuse, but becomes such a crime, of so much malignity, as to have influence upon the effect and consequent, and by communication makes it become criminal. The apostles noted two such causes, Covetousness and Ambition, the former in them of the circumcision, and the latter in Diotrephes and Simon Magus: and there were some that were ἀγόμεναι ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις[t]· they were of the long robe too, but they were the she-disciples, upon whose consciences some false apostles had influence by advantage of their wantonness: and thus the three principles of all sin become also the principles of heresy; the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. And in pursuance of these arts the devil hath not wanted fuel to set awork incendiaries in all ages of the church. The bishops were always honourable, and most commonly had great revenues, and a bishopric would satisfy the two designs of covetousness and ambition; and this hath been the golden apple very often contended for, and very often the cause of great fires in the church. *Thebulis*[u], *quia rejectus ab episcopatu Hierosolymitano, turbare cœpit ecclesiam,* said Hegesippus in Eusebius[v]. Tertullian turned Montanist in discontent for missing the bishopric of Carthage after Agrippinus; and so did Montanus himself for the same discontent, saith Nicephorus[x]. Novatus would have been bishop of Rome, Donatus of Carthage, Arius of Alexandria, Aerius of Sebastia; but they all missed, and therefore

[r] Cont. Fund. [sive Contra ep. Manich.] cap. 4. [tom. viii. col. 153.]
[s] Orat. xxi. [§ 24. tom. i. p. 401 C.]
[t] 2 Tim. iii. [6.]
[u] [al. Thebuthis, Thebutes, Thobutes, Theobutes.]
[v] [Hist. eccl., iv. 22. p. 182.]
[x] [Hist. eccl., iv. 22. tom. i. p. 319.]

all of them vexed christendom. And this was so common a thing that oftentimes the threatening the church with a schism or a heresy was a design to get a bishopric; and Socrates[y] reports of Asterius that he did frequent the conventicles of the Arians, *nam episcopatum aliquem ambiebat.* And setting aside the infirmities of men and their innocent prejudices, Epiphanius makes pride to be the only cause of heresies; ὕβρις καὶ πρόκρισις, 'pride and prejudice' cause them all, the one criminally, the other innocently. And indeed S. Paul[z] does almost make pride the only cause of heresies: his words cannot be expounded, unless it be at least the principal; εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ, and 'consents not to sound words, and the doctrine that is according to godliness,' τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας· ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί.

2. The sum is this; if ever an opinion be begun with pride or managed with impiety, or ends in a crime, the man turns heretic: but let the error be never so great, so it be not against an article of creed, if it be simple and hath no confederation with the personal iniquity of the man, the opinion is as innocent as the person, though perhaps as false as he is ignorant, and therefore shall burn though he himself escape. But in these cases and many more (for the causes of deception increase by all accidents, and weaknesses, and illusions) no man can give certain judgment upon the persons of men in particular, unless the matter of fact and crime be accident and notorious. The man cannot by human judgment be concluded a heretic, unless his opinion be an open recession from plain demonstrative divine authority (which must needs be notorious, voluntary, vincible, and criminal) or that there be a palpable serving of an end accidental and extrinsical to the opinion.

3. But this latter is very hard to be discerned, because those accidental and adherent crimes which makes the man a heretic, in questions not simply fundamental or of necessary practice, are actions so internal and spiritual that cognizance can but seldom be taken of them. And therefore (to instance) though the opinion of purgatory be false, yet to believe it cannot be heresy, if a man be abused into the belief of it invincibly; because it is not a doctrine either fundamentally false or practically impious, it neither proceeds from the will, nor hath any immediate or direct influence upon choice and manners. And as for those other ends of upholding that opinion which possibly its patrons may have, as for the reputation of their church's infallibility, for the advantage of dirges, requiems, masses, monthly minds[a], anniversaries, and other offices for the dead, which usually are very profitable, rich, and easy; these things may possibly have sole influences upon their understanding, but whether

[y] [Hist. eccl., lib. i. cap. 36.]
[z] [1 Tim. vi. 4.]
[a] ['Month's-mind.—A celebration in remembrance of dead persons, a month after their decease.' Nares's Glossary.]

they have or no God only knows. If the proposition and article were true, these ends might justly be subordinate, and consistent with a true proposition. And there are some truths that are also profitable, as the necessity of maintenance to the clergy, the doctrine of restitution, giving alms, lending freely, remitting debts in cases of great necessity: and it would be but an ill argument that the preachers of these doctrines speak false because possibly in these articles they may serve their own ends. For although Demetrius and the craftsmen were without excuse for resisting the preaching of S. Paul because it was notorious they resisted the truth upon ground of profit and personal emoluments, and the matter was confessed by themselves; yet if the clergy should maintain their just rights and revenues which by pious dedications and donatives were long since ascertained upon them, is it to be presumed in order of law and charity that this end is in the men subordinate to truth, because it is so in the thing itself, and that therefore no judgment in prejudice of these truths can be made from that observation?

4. But if *aliunde* we are ascertained of the truth or falsehood of a proposition respectively, yet the judgment of the personal ends of the men cannot ordinarily be certain and judicial, because most commonly the acts are private, and the purposes internal, and temporal ends may sometimes consist with truth; and whether the purposes of the men make these ends principal or subordinate, no man can judge: and be they how they will, yet they do not always prove that when they are conjunct with error, that[b] the error was caused by these purposes and criminal intentions.

5. But in questions practical, the doctrine itself, and the person too, may with more ease be reproved, because matter of fact being evident, and nothing being so certain as the experiments of human affairs, and these being the immediate consequents of such doctrines, are with some more certainty of observation redargued than the speculative, whose judgment is of itself more difficult, more remote from matter and human observation, and with less curiosity and explicitness declared in scripture, as being of less consequence and concernment in order to God's and man's great end. In other things which end in notion and ineffective contemplation, where neither the doctrine is malicious nor the person apparently criminal, he is to be left to the judgment of God: and as there is no certainty of human judicature in this case, so it is to no purpose it should be judged. For if the person may be innocent with his error, and there is no rule whereby it[c] can certainly be pronounced that he is actually criminal (as it happens in matters speculative); since "the end of the commandment is love out of a pure conscience and faith unfeigned[d]," and the commandment may obtain its end in a consistence with this simple speculative error; why should men trouble themselves with

[b] ['that' om. C.] [c] ['he' A, B.] [d] [1 Tim. i. 5.]

such opinions so as to disturb the public charity or the private confidence? Opinions and persons are just so to be judged as other matters and persons criminal. For no man can judge any thing else: it must be a crime, and it must be open, so as to take cognizance and make true human[e] judgment of it. And this is all I am to say concerning the causes of heresies, and of the distinguishing rules for guiding of our judgments towards others.

6. As for guiding our judgments and the use of our reason in judging for ourselves, all that is to be said is reducible to this one proposition: since errors are then made sins, when they are contrary to charity, or inconsistent with a good life and the honour of God, that judgment is the truest, or at least that opinion most innocent, that 1) best promotes the reputation of God's glory, and 2) is the best instrument of holy life. For in questions and interpretations of dispute, these two analogies are the best to make propositions, and conjectures, and determinations. Diligence and care in obtaining the best guides and the most convenient assistances, prayer and modesty of spirit, simplicity of purposes and intentions, humility, and aptness to learn, and a peaceable disposition, are therefore necessary to finding out truths, because they are parts of good life, without which our truths will do us little advantage, and our errors can have no excuse: but with these dispositions, as he is sure to find out all that is necessary, so what truth he inculpably misses of, he is sure is therefore not necessary, because he could not find it, when he did his best and his most innocent endeavours. And this I say to secure the persons; because no rule can antecedently secure the proposition in matters disputable. For even in the proportions and explications of this rule there is infinite variety of disputes; and when the dispute is concerning free-will, one party denies it, because he believes it magnifies the grace of God that it works irresistibly; the other affirms[f], because he believes it engages us upon greater care and piety of our endeavours: the one opinion thinks God reaps the glory of our good actions, the other thinks it charges our bad actions upon Him. So in the question of merit, one part chooses his assertion, because he thinks it encourages us to good works; the other believes it makes us proud, and therefore he rejects it. The first believes it increases piety, the second believes it increases spiritual presumption and vanity; the first thinks it magnifies God's justice, the other thinks it derogates from His mercy. Now then, since neither this nor any ground can secure a man from possibility of mistaking, we were infinitely miserable if it would not secure us from punishment, so long as we willingly consent not to a crime, and do our best endeavour to avoid an error. Only by the way let me observe, that since there are such great differences of apprehension concerning the consequents of an article, no man is to be charged with the odious consequences of his opinion. Indeed his

[e] [vid. p. 386. not. h, supra.]

[f] ['affirms it,' C.]

doctrine is, but the person is not, if he understands not such things to be consequent to his doctrine: for if he did, and then avows them, they are his direct opinions, and he stands as chargeable with them as with his first propositions: but if he disavows them, he would certainly rather quit his opinion than avow such errors or impieties which are pretended to be consequent to it, because every man knows that can be no truth from whence falsehood naturally and immediately does derive, and he therefore believes his first proposition because he believes it innocent of such errors as are charged upon it directly or consequently.

7. So that now, since no error neither for itself nor its consequents is to be charged as criminal upon a pious person; since no simple error is a sin, nor does condemn us before the throne of God; since He is so pitiful to our crimes that He pardons many *de toto et integro*, in all makes abatement for the violence of temptation and the surprisal and invasion of our faculties, and therefore much less will demand of us an account for our weaknesses; and since the strongest understanding cannot pretend to such an immunity and exemption from the condition of men as not to be deceived and confess its weakness: it remains we enquire what deportment is to be used towards persons of a differing persuasion, when we are (I do not say doubtful of a proposition, but) convinced that he that differs from us is in error: for this was the first intention and the last end of this discourse.

§ 18. Of the deportment to be used towards persons disagreeing, and the reasons why they are not to be punished with death, &c.

1. For although every man may be deceived, yet some are right, and may know it too; for every man that may err, does not therefore certainly err; and if he errs because he recedes from his rule, then if he follows it he may do right; and if ever any man upon just grounds did change his opinion, then he was in the right and was sure of it too: and although confidence is mistaken for a just persuasion many times, yet some men are confident, and have reason so to be. Now when this happens, the question is what deportment they are to use towards persons that disagree from them, and by consequence are in error.

2. First then, no Christian is to be put to death, dismembered, or otherwise directly persecuted for his opinion, which does not teach impiety or blasphemy. If it plainly and apparently brings in a crime, and himself does act it or encourage it, then the matter of fact is punishable according to its proportion or malignity: as if he preaches treason or sedition, his opinion is not his excuse, because it brings in a crime; and a man is never the less traitor because he believes it lawful to commit treason: and a man is a murderer if he kills his brother unjustly, although he thinks he does God good service in it. Matters of fact are equally judicable

whether the principle of them be from within or from without: and if a man could pretend to innocence in being seditious, blasphemous, or perjured, by persuading himself it is lawful, there were as great a gate opened to all iniquity as will entertain all the pretences, the designs, the impostures, and disguises, of the world. And therefore God hath taken order that all rules concerning matters of fact and good life shall be so clearly explicated, that without the crime of the man he cannot be ignorant of all his practical duty. And therefore the apostles and primitive doctors made no scruple of condemning such persons for heretics that did dogmatize a sin. He that teaches others to sin is worse than he that commits the crime, whether he be tempted by his own interest or encouraged by the other's doctrine. It was as bad in Basilides to teach it to be lawful to renounce faith and religion and take all manner of oaths and covenants in time of persecution, as if himself had done so. Nay, it is as much worse as the mischief is more universal, or as a fountain is greater than a drop of water taken from it. He that writes treason in a book, or preaches sedition in a pulpit, and persuades it to the people, is the greatest traitor and incendiary, and his opinion there is the fountain of a sin; and therefore could not be entertained in his understanding upon weakness, or inculpable or innocent prejudice; he cannot from scripture or divine revelation have any pretence to colour that so fairly as to seduce either a wise or an honest man. If it rest there and goes no further, it is not cognoscible, and so scapes that way; but if it be published, and comes *a stylo ad machæram* (as Tertullian's[g] phrase is) then it becomes matter of fact in principle and in persuasion, and is just so punishable as is the crime that it persuades. Such were they of whom S. Paul complains, who brought in damnable doctrines and lusts; S. Paul's *utinam abscindantur*[h] is just of them, take it in any sense of rigour and severity, so it be proportionable to the crime or criminal doctrine. Such were those of whom God spake in Deut. xiii., "If any prophet tempts to idolatry, saying, Let us go after other gods, he shall be slain." But these do not come into this question: but the proposition is to be understood concerning questions disputable *in materia intellectuali;* which also, for all that law of killing such false prophets, were permitted with impunity in the Synagogue, as appears beyond exception in the great divisions and disputes between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. I deny not but certain and known idolatry, or any other sort of practical impiety with its principiant doctrine, may be punished corporally, because it is no other but matter of fact; but no matter of mere opinion, no errors that of themselves are not sins, are to be persecuted or punished by death or corporal inflictions. This is now to be proved.

3. Secondly, all the former discourse is sufficient argument how

[g] [vid. De præscr. hær., cap. xxxviii. p. 216.]

[h] [Gal. v. 12.]

easy it is for us in such matters to be deceived. So long as christian religion was a simple profession of the articles of belief and a hearty prosecution of the rules of good life, the fewness of the articles and the clearness of the rule was cause of the seldom prevarication. But when divinity is swelled up to so great a body, when the several questions which the peevishness and wantonness of sixteen ages have commenced, are concentred into one, and from all these questions something is drawn into the body of theology, till it hath ascended up to the greatness of a mountain, and the sum of divinity collected by Aquinas makes a volume as great as was that of Livy, mocked at in the epigram,

Quem mea vix[1] totum bibliotheca capit;

it is impossible for any industry to consider so many particulars in the infinite numbers of questions as are necessary to be considered, before we can with certainty determine any. And after all the considerations, which we can have in a whole age, we are not sure not to be deceived. The obscurity of some questions, the nicety of some articles, the intricacy of some revelations, the variety of human understandings, the windings of logic, the tricks of adversaries, the subtilty of sophisters, the engagement of educations, personal affections, the portentous number of writers, the infinity of authorities, the vastness of some arguments as consisting in enumeration of many particulars, the uncertainty of others, the several degrees of probability, the difficulties of scripture, the invalidity of probation of tradition, the opposition of all exterior arguments to each other, and their open contestation, the public violence done to authors and records, the private arts and supplantings, the falsifyings, the indefatigable industry of some men to abuse all understandings and all persuasions into their own opinions, these and thousands more, even all the difficulty of things and all the weaknesses of man and all the arts of the devil, have made it impossible for any man in so great variety of matter not to be deceived. No man pretends to it but the pope, and no man is more deceived than he is in that very particular.

4. Thirdly, from hence proceeds a danger which is consequent to this proceeding: for if we, who are so apt to be deceived and so insecure in our resolution of questions disputable, should persecute a disagreeing person, we are not sure we do not fight against God. For if his proposition be true and persecuted, then, because all truth derives from God, this proceeding is against God, and therefore this is not to be done, upon Gamaliel's[1] ground, 'lest peradventure we be found to fight against God;' of which because we can have no security (at least) in this case, we have all the guilt of a doubtful or an uncertain conscience. For if there be no security in the thing, as I have largely proved, the conscience in such cases is as uncertain as the question is; and if it be not doubtful where it is uncertain, it is

[1] [Leg. 'non.'—Martial., lib. xiv. epigr. 190.] [1] [Acts v. 39.]

because the man is not wise, but as confident as ignorant; the first without reason, and the second without excuse. And it is very disproportionable for a man to persecute another certainly for a proposition, that if he were wise he would know it is not certain; at least the other person may innocently be uncertain of it. If he be killed, he is certainly killed; but if he be called heretic, it is not so certain that he is a heretic. It were good therefore that proceedings were according to evidence, and the rivers not swell over the banks, nor a certain definitive sentence of death passed upon such persuasions which cannot certainly be defined. And this argument is of so much the more force because we see that the greatest persecutions that ever have been were against truth, even against christianity itself; and it was a prediction of our blessed Saviour that persecution should be the lot of true believers. And if we compute the experience of suffering christendom, and the prediction that truth should suffer, with those few instances of suffering heretics, it is odds but persecution is on the wrong side, and that it is error and heresy that is cruel and tyrannical; especially since the truth of Jesus Christ and of His religion is so meek, so charitable, and so merciful. And we may in this case exactly use the words of S. Paul[k], "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now;" and so it ever will be till Christ's second coming.

5. Fourthly, whoever persecutes a disagreeing person, arms all the world against himself and all pious people of his own persuasion, when the scales of authority return to his adversary[l] and attest his contradictory; and then what can he urge for mercy for himself or his party, that sheweth none to others? If he says that he is to be spared because he believes true, but the other was justly persecuted because he was in error, he is ridiculous. For he is as confidently believed to be a heretic as he believes his adversary such, and whether he be or no being the thing in question, of this he is not to be his own judge, but he that hath authority on his side will be sure to judge against him. So that what either side can indifferently make use of, it is good that neither would, because neither side can with reason sufficiently do it in prejudice of the other. If a man will say that every man must take his adventure, and if it happens authority to be with him he will persecute his adversaries, and if it turns against him he will bear it as well as he can, and hope for a reward of martyrdom and innocent suffering; besides that this is so equal to be said of all sides, and besides that this is a way to make an eternal disunion of hearts and charities, and that it will make

[k] [Gal. iv. 29.]

[l] Quo comperto illi in nostram perniciem licentiore audacia grassabuntur. S. Aug. ep. ad Donat. procons. [ep. c. tom. ii. col. 270.] et contr. ep. Fund. [sive ep. Manich., cap. 3. tom. viii. col. 152.] Ita nunc debeo sustinere, et tanta patientia vobiscum agere quanta mecum egerunt proximi mei, cum in vestro dogmate rabiosus ac cæcus errarem.

christendom nothing but a shambles and a perpetual butchery; and as fast as men's wits grow wanton, or confident, or proud, or abused, so often there will be new executions and massacres; besides all this, it is most unreasonable and unjust, as being contrariant to those laws of justice and charity whereby we are bound with greater zeal to spare and preserve an innocent than to condemn a guilty person, and there's less malice and iniquity in sparing the guilty than in condemning the good: because it is in the power of men to remit a guilty person to divine judicature, and for divers causes not to use severity; but in no case is it lawful, neither hath God at all given to man a power to condemn such persons as cannot be proved other than pious and innocent. And therefore it is better, if it should so happen, that we should spare the innocent person and one that is actually deceived, than that upon the turn of the wheel the true believers should be destroyed.

6. And this very reason He that had authority sufficient and absolute to make laws was pleased to urge as a reasonable inducement for the establishing of that law which He made for the indemnity of erring persons. It was in the parable[m] of the tares mingled with the good seed *in agro dominico*. The good seed (Christ himself being the interpreter) are the children of the kingdom, the tares are the children of the wicked one: upon this comes the precept, "Gather not the tares by themselves, but let them both grow together till the harvest," that is, till the day of judgment. This parable hath been tortured infinitely, to make it confess its meaning, but we shall soon despatch it. All the difficulty and variety of exposition is reducible to these two questions, What is meant by 'Gather not,' and what by 'Tares?' that is, what kind of sword is forbidden, and what kind of persons are to be tolerated. The former is clear; for the spiritual sword is not forbidden to be used to any sort of criminals, for that would destroy the power of excommunication. The prohibition therefore lies against the use of the temporal sword in cutting off some persons. Who they are, is the next difficulty. But by 'tares,' or the 'children of the wicked one,' are meant either persons of ill lives, wicked persons only *in re practica;* or else another kind of evil persons, men criminal or faulty *in re intellectuali*. One or other of these two must be meant, a third I know not. But the former cannot be meant, because it would destroy all bodies politic, which cannot consist without laws, nor laws without a compulsory and a power of the sword; therefore if criminals were to be let alone till the day of judgment, bodies politic must stand or fall *ad arbitrium impiorum*, and nothing good could be protected, not innocence itself, nothing could be secured but violence and tyranny. It follows then that since a kind of persons which are indeed faulty are to be tolerated, it must be meant of persons faulty in another kind, in which the gospel had not in other places clearly

[m] [Matt. xiii.]

established a power externally compulsory: and therefore since in all actions practically criminal a power of the sword is permitted, here where it is denied must mean[n] a crime of another kind, and by consequence errors intellectual, commonly called heresy.

7. And after all this the reason there given confirms this interpretation[o], for therefore it is forbidden to cut off these tares, "lest we also pull up the wheat with them;" which is the sum of these two last arguments. For because heresy is of so nice consideration and difficult sentence, in thinking to root up heresies we may by our[p] mistakes destroy true doctrine: which although it be possible to be done in all cases of practical question by mistake; yet because external actions are more discernible than inward speculations and opinions, innocent persons are not so easily mistaken for the guilty in actions criminal as in matters of inward persuasion. And upon that very reason Saint Martin was zealous to have procured a revocation of a commission granted to certain tribunes to make enquiry in Spain for sects and opinions; for under colour of rooting out the Priscillianists, there was much mischief done, and more likely to happen, to the orthodox. For it happened then as oftentimes since, *Pallore potius et veste quam fide hæreticus dijudicari solebat aliquando per tribunos Maximi.* They were no good inquisitors of heretical pravity, so Sulpitius[q] witnesses. But secondly, the reason says, that therefore these persons are so to be permitted as not to be persecuted, lest when a revolution of human affairs sets contrary opinions in the throne or chair, they who were persecuted before should now themselves become persecutors of others; and so at one time or other, before or after, the wheat be rooted up, and the truth be persecuted. But as these reasons confirm the law and this sense of it; so, abstracting from the law, it is of itself concluding by an argument *ab incommodo*, and that founded upon the principles of justice and right reason, as I formerly alleged.

8. Fifthly, we are not only uncertain of finding out truths in matters disputable, but we are certain that the best and ablest doctors[r] of christendom have been actually deceived in matters of great concernment; which thing is evident in all those instances of persons from whose doctrines all sorts of Christians respectively take liberty

[n] ['must be meant,' C.]

[o] Vide S. Chrysost. homil. xlvii. in cap. xiii. Matth. [tom. vii. p. 482.] et S. August. quæst. in cap. xiii. Matth. [tom. iii. part. 2. col. 282.] S. Cyprian. ep., lib. iii. ep. 1. [leg. ep. 3. al. ep. liv. p. 99.] Theophylact. in xiii. Matth. [p. 75.]

[p] S. Hieron. in cap. xiii. Matt. [tom. iv. col. 59.] ait per hanc parabolam significari ne in rebus dubiis præceps fiat judicium.

[q] [Dial. iii. cap. 11. tom. 1. p. 139.]

[r] Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur et quam difficile caveantur errores; illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata pia mentis serenitate superare; illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quibus et suspiriis et gemitibus fiat ut ex quantulacunque parte possit intelligi Deus; postremo, illi in vos sæviant qui nullo tali errore decepti sunt quali vos deceptos vident. —S. August. cont. ep. Fund. [sive Manich., cap. 2. tom. viii. col. 151.]

to dissent. The errors of Papias, Irenæus, Lactantius, Justin Martyr in the millenary opinion, of S. Cyprian, Firmilian, the Asian and African fathers in the question of re-baptization, S. Austin in his decretory and uncharitable sentence against the unbaptized children of christian parents, the Roman or the Greek doctors in the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and in the matter of images, are examples beyond exception.

—— ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώ-
πων φρεσὶν ἁμπλακίαι
ἀναρίθματοι κρέμανται[a].

Now if these great personages had been persecuted or destroyed for their opinions, who should have answered the invaluable loss the church of God should have sustained in missing so excellent, so exemplary, and so great lights? But then if these persons erred, and by consequence might have been destroyed, what should have become of others whose understanding was lower and their security less, their errors more and their danger greater? At this rate all men should have passed through the fire, for who can escape when S. Cyprian and S. Austin cannot? Now to say these persons were not to be persecuted, because although they had errors, yet none condemned by the church at that time or before, is to say nothing to the purpose, nor nothing that is true. Not true, because S. Cyprian's error was condemned by pope Stephen, which in the present sense of the prevailing party in the church of Rome, is to be condemned by the church: not to the purpose, because it is nothing else but to say that the church did tolerate their errors. For since those opinions were open and manifest to the world, that the church did not condemn them, it was either because those opinions were by the church not thought to be errors; or if they were, yet she thought fit to tolerate the error and the erring person. And if she would do so still, it would in most cases be better than now it is. And yet if the church had condemned them, it had not altered the case as to this question; for either the persons upon the condemnation of their error should have been persecuted, or not. If not, why shall they now, against the instance and precedent of those ages who were confessedly wise and pious, and whose practices are often made to us arguments to follow? If yea, and that they had been persecuted, it is a thing[t] which this argument condemns, and the loss of the church had been invaluable in the losing or the provocation and temptation of such rare personages; and the example and the rule of so ill consequence, that all persons might upon the same ground have suffered; and though some had escaped, yet no man could have any more security from punishment than from error.

9. Sixthly, either the disagreeing person is in error, or not, but a true believer: in either of the cases to persecute him is extremely imprudent. For if he be a true believer, then it is a clear case that

[a] [Pind. olymp., vii. 43.]

[t] ['the thing' A.]

we do open violence to God, and His servants, and His truth. If he be in error, what greater folly and stupidity than to give to error the glory of martyrdom, and the advantages which are accidentally consequent to a persecution? For as it was true of the martyrs, *Quoties morimur toties nascimur*, and the increase of their trouble was the increase of their confidence and the establishment of their persuasions; so it is in all false opinions, for that an opinion is true or false is extrinsical or accidental to the consequents and advantages it gets by being afflicted. And there is a popular pity that follows all persons in misery, and that compassion breeds likeness of affections, and that very often produces likeness of persuasion; and so much the rather, because there arises a jealousy and pregnant suspicion that they who persecute an opinion are destitute of sufficient arguments to confute it, and that the hangman is the best disputant. For if those arguments which they have for their own doctrine were a sufficient ground of confidence and persuasion, men would be more willing to use those means and arguments which are better compliances with human understanding, which more naturally do satisfy it, which are more humane and christian, than that way is[t] which satisfies none, which destroys many, which provokes more, and[t] which makes all men jealous. To which add, that those who die for their opinion leave in all men great arguments of the heartiness of their belief, of the confidence of their persuasion, of the piety and innocency of their persons, of the purity of their intention and simplicity of purposes, that they are persons totally disinterest[u] and separate from design. For no interest can be so great as to be put in balance against a man's life and his soul, and he does very imprudently serve his ends who seeingly and foreknowingly loses his life in the prosecution of them. Just as if Titius should offer to die for Sempronius upon condition he might receive twenty talents when he had done his work. It is certainly an argument of a great love, and a great confidence, and a great sincerity, and a great hope, when a man lays down his life in attestation of a proposition. "Greater love than this hath no man, than to lay down his life," saith our blessed Saviour[v]. And althongh laying of a wager is an argument of confidence more than truth; yet laying such a wager, staking of a man's soul and pawning his life, gives a hearty testimony that the person is honest, confident, resigned, charitable, and noble. And I know not whether truth can do a person or a cause more advantages than these can do to an error. And therefore besides the impiety, there is great imprudence in canonizing a heretic, and consecrating an error by such means which were better preserved as encouragements of truth and comforts to real and true martyrs. And it is not amiss to observe that this very advantage was taken by heretics, who were ready to shew and boast their catalogues of martyrs: in particular the Circumcellians did so, and the Donatists; and yet the first were heretics,

[t] ['is' 'and' om. A, B.] [u] ['disinteressed' C.] [v] [John xv. 13.]

the second schismatics. And it was remarkable in the scholars of Priscillian, who as they had their master in the reputation of a saint while he was living, so when he was dead they had him in veneration as a martyr; they with reverence and devotion carried his and the bodies of his slain companions to an honourable sepulture, and counted it religion to swear by the name of Priscillian. So that the extinguishing of the person gives life and credit to his doctrine, and when he is dead he yet speaks more effectually.

10. Seventhly, it is unnatural and unreasonable to persecute disagreeing opinions. Unnatural; for understanding, being a thing wholly spiritual, cannot be restrained, and therefore neither punished, by corporal afflictions. It is *in aliena republica*, a matter of another world. You may as well cure the colic by brushing a man's clothes, or fill a man's belly with a syllogism. These things do not communicate in matter, and therefore neither in action nor passion. And since all punishments in a prudent government punish the offender to prevent a future crime, and so it proves more medicinal than vindictive, the punitive act being in order to the cure and prevention; and since no punishment of the body can cure a disease in the soul; it is disproportionable in nature, and in all civil government, to punish where the punishment can do no good. It may be an act of tyranny, but never of justice. For is an opinion ever the more true or false for being persecuted? Some men have believed it the more, as being provoked into a confidence, and vexed into a resolution; but the thing itself is not the truer: and though the hangman may confute a man with an inexplicable dilemma, yet not convince his understanding; for such premises can infer no conclusion but that of a man's life; and a wolf may as well give laws to the understanding, as he whose dictates are only propounded in violence and writ in blood: and a dog is as capable of a law as a man, if there be no choice in his obedience, nor discourse in his choice, nor reason to satisfy his discourse.—And as it is unnatural, so it is unreasonable that Sempronius should force Caius to be of his opinion because Sempronius is consul this year and commands the lictors: as if he that can kill a man, cannot but be infallible; and if he be not, why should I do violence to my conscience because he can do violence to my person?

11. Eighthly, force in matters of opinion can do no good, but is very apt to do hurt; for no man can change his opinion when he will, or be satisfied in his reason that his opinion is false because discountenanced. If a man could change his opinion when he lists, he might cure many inconveniences of his life: all his fears and his sorrows would soon disband, if he would but alter his opinion whereby he is persuaded that such an accident that afflicts him is an evil, and such an object formidable: let him but believe himself impregnable, or that he receives a benefit when he is plundered, disgraced, imprisoned, condemned, and afflicted, neither his

steps[w] need to be disturbed nor his quietness discomposed. But if a man cannot change his opinion when he lists, nor ever does heartily or resolutely but when he cannot do otherwise, then to use force may make him a hypocrite, but never to be a right believer; and so instead of erecting a trophy to God and true religion, we build a monument for the devil. Infinite examples are recorded in church story to this very purpose: but Socrates[x] instances in one for all; for when Eleusius bishop of Cyzicum was threatened by the emperor Valens with banishment and confiscation if he did not subscribe to the decree of Ariminum, at last he yielded to the Arian opinion, and presently fell into great torment of conscience, openly at Cyzicum recanted the error, asked God and the church forgiveness, and complained of the emperor's injustice: and that was all the good the Arian party got by offering violence to his conscience. And so many families in Spain, which are (as they call them) new Christians, and of a suspected faith, into which they were forced by the tyranny of the inquisition, and yet are secret Moors, is evidence enough of the inconvenience[y] of preaching a doctrine *in ore gladii cruentandi*. For it either punishes a man for keeping a good conscience, or forces him into a bad; it either punishes sincerity or persuades hypocrisy; it persecutes a truth or drives into error: and it teaches a man to dissemble and to be safe, but never to be honest.

12. Ninthly, it is one of the glories of christian religion that it was so pious, excellent, miraculous, and persuasive, that it came in upon its own piety and wisdom, with no other force but a torrent of arguments and demonstration of the Spirit; a mighty rushing wind to beat down all strong holds and every high thought and imagination; but towards the persons of men it was always full of meekness and charity, compliance and toleration, condescension and bearing with one another, 'restoring persons overtaken with an error in the spirit of meekness, considering lest we also be tempted[z].' The consideration is as prudent, and the proposition as just, as the precept is charitable, and the precedent was pious and holy. Now things are best conserved with that which gives it the first being, and which is agreeable to its temper and constitution. That precept which it chiefly preaches in order to all the blessedness in the world, that is, of meekness, mercy, and charity, should also preserve itself and promote its own interest. For indeed nothing will do it so well, nothing doth so excellently insinuate itself into the understandings and affections of men, as when the actions and persuasions of a sect, and every part and principle and promotion, are univocal. And it would

[w] ['sleeps' A; but the printing is doubtful.]

[x] [Hist. eccles., lib. iv. cap. 6.]

[y] Ejusmodi fuit Hipponensium conversio, cujus quidem species decepit August. ita ut opinaretur hæreticos licet non morte trucidandos vi tamen coercendos; experientia enim demonstravit eos tam facile ad Arianismum transiisse atque ad catholicismum, cum Ariani principes rerum in ea civitate potirentur.

[z] [Gal. vi. 1.]

be a mighty disparagement to so glorious an institution, that in its principle it should be merciful and humane, and in the promotion and propagation of it so inhuman: and it would be improbable and unreasonable that the sword should be used in the persuasion of one proposition, and yet in the persuasion of the whole religion nothing like it. To do so may serve the end of a temporal prince, but never promote the honour of Christ's kingdom; it may secure a design of Spain, but will very much disserve christendom, to offer to support it by that which good men believe to be a distinctive cognizance of the Mahometan religion from the excellency and piety of christianity, whose sense and spirit is described in those excellent words of S. Paul[a], "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging the truth." They that oppose themselves, must not be strucken by any of God's servants; and if yet any man will smite these who are his opposites in opinion, he will get nothing by that, he must quit the title of being a servant of God for his pains. And I think a distinction of persons secular and ecclesiastical will do no advantage for an escape, because even the secular power, if it be christian and a servant of God, must not be πληκτικός· δοῦλον Κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, I mean in those cases where meekness of instruction is the remedy; or if the case be irremediable, abscission by censures is the penalty.

13. Tenthly; and if yet in the nature of the thing it were neither unjust nor unreasonable, yet there is nothing under God almighty that hath power over the soul of man, so as to command a persuasion, or to judge a disagreeing. Human positive laws direct all external acts in order to several ends, and the judges take cognizance accordingly; but no man can command the will, or punish him that obeys the law against his will: for because its end is served in external obedience, it neither looks after more, neither can it be served by more, nor take notice of any more. And yet possibly the understanding is less subject to human power than the will: for that human power hath a command over external acts, which naturally and regularly flow from the will and *ut plurimum* suppose a direct act of will, but always either a direct or indirect volition, primary or accidental; but the understanding is a natural faculty subject to no command, but where the command is itself a reason fit to satisfy and persuade it. And therefore God, commanding us to believe such revelations, persuades and satisfies the understanding by His commanding and revealing; for there is no greater probation in the world that a proposition is true than because God hath commanded us to believe it. But because no man's command is a satisfaction to the understanding or a verification of the proposition, therefore the understanding

[a] [2 Tim. ii. 24.]

is not subject to human authority: they may persuade, but not enjoin where God hath not; and where God hath, if it appears so to him, he is an infidel if he does not believe it. And if all men have no other efficacy or authority on the understanding but by persuasion, proposal, and entreaty, then a man is bound to assent but according to the operation of the argument, and the energy of persuasion; neither indeed can he, though he would never so fain: and he that out of fear, and too much compliance, and desire to be safe, shall desire to bring his understanding with some luxation to the belief of human dictates and authorities, may as often miss of the truth as hit it, but is sure always to lose the comfort of truth, because he believes it upon indirect, insufficient, and incompetent arguments: and as his desire it should be so is his best argument that it is so, so the pleasing of men is his best reward, and his not being condemned and contradicted, all the possession of a truth.

§ 14. Of the practice of christian churches towards persons disagreeing, and when persecution first came in.

AND thus this truth hath been practised in all times of christian religion, when there were no collateral designs on foot, nor interests to be served, nor passions to be satisfied. In S. Paul's time, though the censure of heresy were not so loose and forward as afterwards, and all that were called heretics were clearly such and highly criminal, yet as their crime was, so was their censure, that is, spiritual. They were first admonished, once at least, for so Irenæus[b], Tertullian[c], Cyprian[d], Ambrose[e], and Hierome[f], read that place of Titus iii.; but since that time all men, and at that time some read it, *Post unam et alteram admonitionem*, reject a heretic; 'rejection from the communion of saints after two warnings,' that's the penalty. S. John expresses it by 'not eating with them,' 'not bidding them God speed[g];' but the persons against whom he decrees so severely are such as denied Christ to be come in the flesh, direct antichrists. And let the sentence be as high as it lists in this case, all that I observe is that since in so damnable doctrines nothing but spiritual censure, separation from the communion of the faithful, was enjoined and prescribed, we cannot pretend to an apostolical precedent if in matters of dispute and innocent question, and of great uncertainty and no malignity, we shall proceed to sentence of death.

2. For it is but an absurd and illiterate arguing to say that excommunication is a greater punishment, and killing a less, and therefore whoever may be excommunicated may also be put to death; which indeed is the reasoning that Bellarmine uses. For first, excommunication is not directly and of itself a greater punishment than corporal

[b] Lib. iii. cap. 3. [p. 177.]
[c] De præscr. hær. [cap. vi. p. 204 A.]
[d] Lib. [iii.] ad Quirinum. [cap. 78. p. 86.]
[e] In hunc locum. [tom. ii. append. col. 316 E.]
[f] Ibid. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 438 fin.]
[g] [vid. 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 John 11.]

death, because it is indefinite and incomplete, and in order to a further punishment; which if it happens, then the excommunication was the inlet to it; if it does not, the excommunication did not signify half so much as the loss of a member, much less death. For it may be totally ineffectual, either by the iniquity of the proceeding, or repentance of the person; and in all times and cases it is a medicine, if the man please; if he will not, but perseveres in his impiety, then it is himself that brings the censure to effect, that actuates the judgment, and gives a sting and an energy upon that which otherwise would be χεὶρ ἄκυρος[h]. Secondly, but when it is at worst, it does not kill the soul; it only consigns it to that death which it had deserved, and should have received independently from that sentence of the church. Thirdly, and yet excommunication is to admirable purpose; for whether it refers to the person censured or to others, it is prudential in itself, it is exemplary to others, it is medicinal to all. For the person censured is by this means threatened into piety, and the threatening made the more energetical upon him, because by fiction of law, or as it were by a sacramental representment, the pains of hell are made presential to him, and so becomes an act of prudent judicature, and excellent discipline, and the best instrument of spiritual government; because the nearer the threatening is reduced to matter, and the more present and circumstantiate[i] it is made, the more operative it is upon our spirits while they are immerged in matter. And this is the full sense and power of excommunication in its direct intention: consequently and accidentally other evils might follow it; as in the times of the apostles the censured persons were buffeted by Satan, and even at this day there is less security even to the temporal condition of such a person whom his spiritual parents have anathematized. But besides this I know no warrant to affirm any thing of excommunication; for the sentence of the church does but declare, not effect the final sentence of damnation. Whoever deserves excommunication deserves damnation; and he that repents shall be saved, though he die out of the church's external communion; and if he does not repent, he shall be damned though he was not excommunicate.

3. But suppose it greater than the sentence of corporal death, yet it follows not because heretics may be excommunicate, therefore killed; for from a greater to a less in a several kind of things the argument concludes not. It is a greater thing to make an excellent discourse than to make a shoe; yet he that can do the greater, cannot do this less. An angel cannot beget a man, and yet he can do a greater matter in that kind of operations which we term spiritual and angelical. And if this were concluding, that whoever may be excommunicate may be killed, then, because of excommunications the church is confessed the sole and entire judge, she is also an

[h] [cf. 'Episcopacy asserted,' § xv. p. 62 supra.]
[i] ['circumstantionate' (see errata) A.]

absolute disposer of the lives of persons. I believe this will be but ill doctrine in Spain: for in *Bulla cœnæ Domini*[1] the king of Spain is every year excommunicated on Maundy-Thursday; but if by the same power he might also be put to death (as upon this ground he may) the pope might with more ease be invested in that part of S. Peter's patrimony which that king hath invaded and surprised. But besides this, it were extreme harsh doctrine in a Roman consistory, from whence excommunications issue for trifles, for fees, for not suffering themselves infinitely to be oppressed, for any thing: if this be greater than death, how great a tyranny is that which doth more than kill men for less than trifles, or else how inconsequent is that argument which concludes its purpose upon so false pretence and supposition?

4. Well, however zealous the apostles were against heretics, yet none were by them or their dictates put to death. The death of Ananias and Sapphira, and the blindness of Elymas the sorcerer, amount not to this, for they were miraculous inflictions: and the first was a punishment to vow-breach and sacrilege, the second of sorcery and open contestation against the religion of Jesus Christ; neither of them concerned the case of this present question. Or if the case were the same, yet the authority is not the same: for he that inflicted these punishments was infallible, and of a power competent; but no man at this day is so. But as yet people were converted by miracles, and preaching, and disputing, and heretics by the same means were redargued, and all men instructed, none tortured for their opinion. And this continued till christian people were vexed by disagreeing persons, and were impatient and peevish by their own too much confidence and the luxuriancy of a prosperous fortune; but then they would not endure persons that did dogmatize any thing which might intrench upon their reputation or their interest. And it is observable that no man nor no age did ever teach the lawfulness of putting heretics to death till they grew wanton with prosperity: but when the reputation of the governors was concerned, when the interests of men were endangered, when they had something to lose, when they had built their estimation upon the credit of disputable questions, when they began to be jealous of other men, when they overvalued themselves and their own opinions, when some persons invaded bishoprics upon pretence of new opinions: then they, as they thrived in the favour of emperors and in the success of their disputes, solicited the temporal power to banish, to fine, to imprison, and to kill their adversaries.

5. So that the case stands thus: In the best times, amongst the best men, when there were fewer temporal ends to be served, when

[1] [So called from being published annually on Maundy Thursday, or *Dies cœnæ Domini*, the anniversary of the institution of the Lord's Supper; it excommunicates and anathematizes all heretics and schismatics of whatever name or sect; all who appeal from the orders or decrees of the bishop of Rome.]

religion and the pure and simple designs of christianity were only to be promoted, in those times and amongst such men no persecution was actual, nor persuaded nor allowed, towards disagreeing persons. But as men had ends of their own and not of Christ's[k], as they receded from their duty and religion from its purity, as christianity began to be compounded with interests and blended with temporal designs, so men were persecuted for their opinions. This is most apparent if we consider when persecution first came in, and if we observe how it was checked by the holiest and the wisest persons.

6. The first great instance I shall note was in Priscillian and his followers, who were condemned to death by the tyrant Maximus. Which instance although S. Hierome observes as a punishment and judgment for the crime of heresy, yet is of no use in the present question, because Maximus put some Christians of all sorts to death promiscuously, catholic and heretic without choice; and therefore the Priscillianists might as well have called it a judgment upon the catholics, as the catholics upon them.

7. But when Ursatus and Itacius, two bishops, procured the Priscillianists' death by the power they had at court, S. Martin was so angry at them for their cruelty that he excommunicated them both. And S. Ambrose upon the same stock denied his communion to the *Itaciani*. And the account that Sulpicius[l] gives of the story is this, *Hoc modo*, says he, *homines luce indignissimi pessimo exemplo necati sunt:* the example was worse than the men; if the men were heretical, the execution of them however was unchristian.

8. But it was of more authority that the Nicene fathers supplicated the emperor[m] and prevailed for the banishment of Arius. Of this we can give no other account, but that by the history of the time we see baseness enough and personal misdemeanour and factiousness of spirit in Arius[n] to have deserved worse than banishment, though the obliquity of his opinion were not put into the balance; which we have reason to believe was not so much as considered, because Constantine gave toleration to differing opinions, and Arius himself was restored upon such conditions to his country and office, which would not stand with the ends of the catholics, if they had been severe exactors of concurrence and union of persuasions.

9. I am still within the scene of ecclesiastical persons, and am considering what the opinion of the learnedst and the holiest prelates were concerning this great question. If we will believe S. Austin[o] (who was a credible person) no good man did allow it, *Nullis tamen bonis in catholica hoc placet, si usque ad mortem in quenquam licet*

[k] ['Christ,' C.]

[l] [Hist. sacr., lib. ii. cap. 47 sq. tom. ii. p. 254.]

[m] Sozom., lib. i. cap. 20. [p. 38.]

[n] Socrat., lib. i. cap. 26. [p. 61.]

[o] Cont. Crescon. grammat., lib. iii. cap. 50. [tom. ix. col. 463.]—Vid. etiam epistt. clviii. clix. [al. cxxxix. cxxxiii. tom. ii. coll. 419 et 396.] et lib. i. cap. 29. Cont. lit. Petilian. [tom. ix. col. 218.]—Vid. etiam Socr., lib. iii. cap. 3, et [lib. vii.?] cap. 29. pp. 175, 378.]

hæreticum sæviatur. This was S. Austin's final opinion[p]: for he had first been of the mind that it was not honest to do any violence to mispersuaded persons; and when upon an accident happening in Hippo he had altered and retracted that part of the opinion, yet then also he excepted death, and would by no means have any mere opinion made capital. But for aught appears, S. Austin had greater reason to have retracted that retractation than his first opinion: for his saying of *nullis bonis placet,* was as true as the thing was reasonable it should be so. Witness those known testimonies of Tertullian[q], Cyprian[r], Lactantius[s], Hieromet[t], Severus Sulpicius[u], Minutius[v], Hilary[x], Damascene[y], Chrysostom[z], Theophylact[a], and Bernard[b]; and divers others, whom the reader may find quoted by the archbishop of Spalato, lib. vii. *De rep. eccles.* c. 8[c].

10. Against this concurrent testimony my reading can furnish me with no adversary nor contrary instances, but in Atticus of C. P., Theodosius of Synada, in Itacius and Ursatus before reckoned. Only indeed some of the later popes of Rome began to be busy and unmerciful: but it was then when themselves were secure, and their interests great, and their temporal concernments highly considerable.

11. For it is most true, and not amiss to observe it, that no man who was under the ferula did ever think it lawful to have opinions forced, or heretics put to death; and yet many men who themselves have escaped the danger of a pile and a faggot, have changed their opinion just as the case was altered, that is, as themselves were unconcerned in the suffering. Petilian, Parmenian, and Gaudentius[d], by no means would allow it lawful, for themselves were in danger, and were upon that side that is ill thought of and discountenanced: but Gregory and Leo[e], popes of Rome, upon whose side the authority and advantages were, thought it lawful they should be punished and persecuted, for themselves were unconcerned in the danger of suffering. And therefore S. Gregory[f] commends the exarch of Ravenna[g] for forcing them who dissented from those men who called themselves the church. And there were some divines in the Lower Germany,

[p] Lib. ii. cap. 5. Retract. [tom. i. col. 43.]—Vid. ep. xlviii. [al. xciii. tom. ii. col. 230.] ad Vincent. script. post Retract. et ep. l. [al. clxxxv. tom. ii. col. 643.] ad Bonifac.

[q] Ad Scapulam. [per tot. præsert., cap. ii. p. 69 A.]

[r] Lib. iii. ep. 1. epist. [? lib. i. ep. 3. al. ep. lix. p. 126 sqq. cf. p. 465. not. y, supra.]

[s] Lib. v. cap. 20. [tom. i. p. 414.]

[t] In cap. xiii. Matth. [tom. iv. col. 59.] et in cap. ii. Hos. [tom. iii. col. 1244.]

[u] In vit. S. Martin. [tom. i. init.]

[v] Octav. [?]

[x] Contr. Auxent. Arr. [§ 4. col. 1265 A.]

[y] 3 Sect. c. 32. [?]

[z] In cap. xiii. Matth. hom. 4. [leg. 47. tom. vii. p. 482.]

[a] In evang. Matth. [cap. xiii. pp. 75, 7.]

[b] In verb. apost. 'Fides ex auditu.' [?]

[c] [tom. iii. p. 116 sqq.]

[d] Apud Aug., lib. i. [cap. 10.] contr. ep. Parmenian. et lib. ii. cap. 10. contr. lit. Petilian. [tom. ix. coll. 21 et 223.]

[e] Ep. i. ad Turbium. [al. Turribium, Austr. episc., p. 164 sq.]

[f] Lib. i. ep. 72. [al. 74. tom. ii. col. 559.]

[g] [? Africa.]

who upon great reasons spake against the tyranny of the inquisition, and restraining prophesying, who yet when they had shaken off the Spanish yoke began to persecute their brethren. It was unjust in them, in all men unreasonable and uncharitable, and often increases the error, but never lessens the danger.

12. But yet although the church, I mean in her distinct and clerical capacity, was against destroying or punishing difference in opinion, till the popes of Rome did superseminate and persuade the contrary; yet the bishops did persuade the emperors to make laws against heretics, and to punish disobedient persons with fines, with imprisonment, with death and banishment respectively. This indeed calls us to a new account. For the churchmen might not proceed to blood nor corporal inflictions, but might they not deliver over to the secular arm, and persuade temporal princes to do it? For this I am to say, that since it is notorious that the doctrine of the clergy was against punishing heretics, the laws which were made by the emperors against them might be for restraint of differing religion in order to the preservation of the public peace, which is too frequently violated by the division of opinions. But I am not certain whether that was always the reason, or whether or no some bishops of the court did not also serve their own ends in giving their princes such untoward counsel; but we find the laws made severally to several purposes, in divers cases and with different severity. Constantine the emperor[h] made a sanction *ut parem cum fidelibus ii qui errant pacis et quietis fruitionem gaudentes accipiant.* The emperor Gratian[i] decreed *ut quam quisque vellet religionem sequeretur, et conventus ecclesiasticos semoto metu omnes agerent;* but he excepted the Manichees, the Photinians, and the Eunomians. Theodosius the elder made a law of death against the anabaptists of his time, and banished Eunomius, and against other erring persons appointed a pecuniary mulct; but he did no executions so severe as his sanctions, to shew they were made *in terrorem* only. So were the laws of Valentinian and Marcian, decreeing *contra omnes qui prava docere tentant* that they should be put to death; so did Michael[j] the emperor: but Justinian[j] only decreed banishment.

13. But whatever whispers some politics might make to their princes, as the wisest and holiest did not think it lawful for churchmen alone to do executions, so neither did they transmit such persons to the secular judicature. And therefore when the edict of Macedonius the president was so ambiguous that it seemed to threaten death to heretics unless they recanted, S. Austin[k] admonished him carefully

[h] Apud Euseb. de vit. Constant. [lib. ii. cap. 56.]

[i] Vide Socr. l. vii. c. 12. [leg. lib. v. capp. 2, 20.]—Vid. Cod. de hæret. l. 'Manich.' et l. 'Ariani,' et l. 'Quicunque,' [lib. i. tit. 5. legg. 4—12.]

[j] [Ambo] apud Paulum Diac. [Hist. miscell.] lib. xvi. et xxiv. [in Murator. Rer. Ital. scriptt., tom. i. pp. 104 sqq., 176 sqq.]

[k] [ep. cliii. tom. ii. col. 524 sqq.]

to provide that no heretic should be put to death, alleging it also not only to be unchristian but illegal also, and not warranted by imperial constitutions; for before his time no laws were made for their being put to death: but however he prevailed that Macedonius published another edict, more explicit, and less seemingly severe. But in his epistle to Donatus the African proconsul[1] he is more confident and determinate, *Necessitate nobis impacta et indicta ut etiam occidi ab eis eligamus quam eos occidendos vestris judiciis ingeramus.*

14. But afterwards many got a trick of giving them over to the secular power; which at the best is no better than hypocrisy, removing envy from themselves and laying it upon others, a refusing to do that in external act which they do in counsel and approbation; which is a transmitting the act to another, and retaining a proportion of guilt unto themselves, even their own and the others too.—I end this with the saying of Chrysostom[m], *Dogmata impia et quæ ab hæreticis profecta sunt arguere et anathematizare oportet, hominibus autem parcendum et pro salute eorum orandum.*

§ 15. How far the church or governors may act to the restraining false or differing opinions.

But although heretical persons are not to be destroyed, yet heresy being a work of the flesh, and all heretics criminal persons whose acts and doctrine have influence upon communities of men whether ecclesiastical or civil, the governors of the republic or church respectively are to do their duties in restraining those mischiefs which may happen to their several charges, for whose indemnity they are answerable. And therefore according to the effect or malice of the doctrine or the person, so the cognizance of them belongs to several judicatures. If it be false doctrine in any capacity, and doth mischief in any sense, or teaches ill life in any instance, or encourages evil in any particular, δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, these men 'must be silenced,' they must be convinced by sound doctrine, and put to silence by spiritual evidence, and restrained by authority ecclesiastical, that is, by spiritual censures, according as it seems necessary to him who is most concerned in the regiment of the church. For all this we have precept and precedent apostolical, and much reason. For by thus doing the governor of the church uses all that authority that is competent, and all the means that is reasonable, and that proceeding which is regular, that he may discharge his cure and secure his flock. And that he possibly may be deceived in judging a doctrine to be heretical, and by consequence the person excommunicate suffers injury, is no argument against the reasonableness of the proceeding; for all the injury that is, is visible and in appearance, and so is his crime. Judges must judge according to their best reason, guided by law of God as their rule, and by evidence and appearance as their best instrument; and they can judge no better. If the judges be good and prudent, the error of

[1] [ep. c. tom. ii. col. 270.] [m] Serm. de anathemate. [ad fin. tom. i. p. 696.]

proceeding will not be great nor ordinary; and there can be no better establishment of human judicature than is a fallible proceeding upon an infallible ground. And if the judgment of heresy be made by estimate and proportion of the opinion to a good or a bad life respectively, supposing an error in the deduction, there will be no malice in the conclusion; and that he endeavours to secure piety according to the best of his understanding, and yet did mistake in his proceeding, is only an argument that he did his duty after the manner of men, possibly with the piety of a saint though not with the understanding of an angel. And the little inconvenience that happens to the person injuriously judged, is abundantly made up in the excellency of the discipline, the goodness of the example, the care of the public, and all those great influences into the manners of men which derive from such an act so publicly consigned. But such public judgment in matters of opinion must be seldom and curious, and never but to secure piety and a holy life; for in matters speculative as all determinations are fallible, so scarce any of them are to purpose, nor ever able to make compensation of either side, either for the public fraction, or the particular injustice if it should so happen in the censure.

2. But then as the church may proceed thus far, yet no christian man or community of men may proceed further. For if they be deceived in their judgment and censure, and yet have passed only spiritual censures, they are totally ineffectual and come to nothing; there is no effect remaining upon the soul, and such censures are not to meddle with the body so much as indirectly. But if any other judgment pass upon persons erring, such judgments whose effects remain, if the person be unjustly censured, nothing will answer and make compensation for such injuries. If a person be excommunicate unjustly, it will do him no hurt; but if he be killed or dismembered unjustly, that censure and infliction is not made ineffectual by his innocence, he is certainly killed and dismembered. So that as the church's authority in such cases so restrained and made prudent, cautelous and orderly, is just and competent; so the proceeding is reasonable, it is provident for the public, and the inconveniences that may fall upon particulars so little, as that the public benefit makes ample compensation, so long as the proceeding is but spiritual.

3. This discourse is in the case of such opinions which by the former rules are formal heresies, and upon practical inconveniences. But for matters of question which have not in them an enmity to the public tranquillity, as the republic hath nothing to do, upon the ground of all the former discourses; so if the church meddles with them where they do not derive into ill life either in the person or in the consequent, or else are destructions of the foundation of religion (which is all one, for that those fundamental articles are of greatest necessity in order to a virtuous and godly life, which is wholly built upon them, and therefore are principally necessary) if she meddles

further otherwise than by preaching and conferring and exhortation, she becomes tyrannical in her government, makes herself an immediate judge of consciences and persuasions, lords it over their faith, destroys unity and charity: and as he[n] that dogmatizes the opinion, becomes criminal if he troubles the church with an immodest, peevish, and pertinacious proposal of his article, not simply necessary; so the church does not do her duty if she so condemns it *pro tribunali*, as to enjoin him and all her subjects to believe the contrary. And as there may be pertinacy in doctrine, so there may be pertinacy in judging; and both are faults. The peace of the church and the unity of her doctrine is best conserved when it is judged by the proportion it hath to that rule of unity which the apostles gave, that is the creed, for articles of mere belief, and the precepts of Jesus Christ, and the practical rules of piety, which are most plain and easy, and without controversy, set down in the gospels and writings of the apostles. But to multiply articles, and adopt them into the family of the faith, and to require assent to such articles which (as S. Paul's[o] phrase is) are of 'doubtful disputation,' equal to that assent we give to matters of faith, is to build a tower upon the top of a bulrush: and the further the effect of such proceedings does extend, the worse they are: the very making such a law is unreasonable, the inflicting spiritual censures upon them that cannot do so much violence to their understanding as to obey it, is unjust and ineffectual; but to punish the person with death or with corporal infliction, indeed it is effectual, but it is therefore tyrannical.

We have seen what the church may do towards restraining false or differing opinions: next I shall consider by way of corollary, what the prince may do as for his interest, and only in securing his people, and serving the ends of true religion.

§ 16. Whether it be lawful for a prince to give toleration to several religions.

1. For upon these very grounds we may easily give account of that great question whether it be lawful for a prince to give toleration to several religions. For first, it is a great fault that men will call the several sects of Christians by the names of several religions. The religion of Jesus Christ is the form of sound doctrine and wholesome words which is set down in scripture indefinitely, actually conveyed to us by plain places, and separated as for the question of necessary or not necessary by the symbol of the apostles. Those impertinencies which the wantonness and vanity of men hath commenced, which their interests have promoted, which serve not truth so much as their own ends, are far from being distinct religions; for matters of opinion are no parts of the worship of God, nor in order to it but as they promote obedience to His commandments; and when they contribute towards it, are in that proportion as they contribute, parts, and actions, and minute particulars of that

[n] ['and as if he' A, B.]

[o] [Rom. xiv. 1.]

religion to whose end they do or pretend to serve. And such are all the sects and all the pretences of Christians, but pieces and minutes of christianity, if they do serve the great end; as every man for his own sect and interest believes for his share it does.

2. Toleration hath a double sense or purpose: for sometimes by it men understand a public license and exercise of a sect; sometimes it is only an indemnity of the persons privately to convene and to opine as they see cause, and as they mean to answer to God. Both these are very much to the same purpose, unless some persons whom we are bound to satisfy be scandalized, and then the prince is bound to do as he is bound to satisfy. To God it is all one; for abstracting from the offence of persons, which is to be considered just as our obligation is to content the persons, it is all one whether we indulge to them to meet publicly or privately, to do actions of religion concerning which we are not persuaded that they are truly holy. To God it is just one to be in the dark and in the light, the thing is the same, only the circumstance of public and private is different: which cannot be concerned in any thing, nor can it concern any thing, but the matter of scandal and relation to the minds and fantasies of certain persons.

3. So that to tolerate is, not to persecute; and the question whether the prince may tolerate divers persuasions, is no more than whether he may lawfully persecute any man for not being of his opinion. Now in this case he is just so to tolerate diversity of persuasions as he is to tolerate public actions: for no opinion is judicable, nor no person punishable, but for a sin; and if his opinion, by reason of its managing or its effect, be a sin in itself or becomes a sin to the person, then as he is to do towards other sins, so to that opinion or man so opining. But to believe so or not so when there is no more but mere believing, is not in his power to enjoin, therefore not to punish. And it is not only lawful to tolerate disagreeing persuasions, but the authority of God only is competent to take notice of it, and infallible to determine it, and fit to judge; and therefore no human authority is sufficient to do all those things, which can justify the inflicting temporal punishments upon such as do not conform in their persuasions to a rule or authority, which is not only fallible, but supposed by the disagreeing person to be actually deceived.

4. But I consider that in the toleration of a different opinion, religion is not properly and immediately concerned, so as in any degree to be endangered. For it may be safe in diversity of persuasions; and it is also a part of christian religion[p], that the liberty of men's consciences should be preserved in all things where God hath not set a limit and made a restraint; that the soul of man should be free, and acknowledge no master but Jesus Christ; that

[p] Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique quod putaverit colere: . . sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi.—Tertul. ad Scapulam. [cap. ii. p. 69 A.]

matters spiritual should not be restrained by punishments corporal; that the same meekness and charity should be preserved in the promotion of christianity, that gave it foundation and increment and firmness in its first publication; that conclusions should not be more dogmatical than the virtual resolution and efficacy of the premises; and that the persons should not more certainly be condemned than their opinions confuted; and lastly, that the infirmities of men and difficulties of things should be both put in balance, to make abatement in the definitive sentence against men's persons. But then because toleration of opinions is not properly a question of religion, it may be a question of policy: and although a man may be a good christian though he believe an error not fundamental, and not directly or evidently impious, yet his opinion may accidentally disturb the public peace, through the overactiveness of the persons, and the confidence of their belief, and the opinion of its appendent necessity; and therefore toleration of differing persuasions in these cases is to be considered upon political grounds, and is just so to be admitted or denied as the opinions or toleration of them may consist with the public and necessary ends of government. Only this; as christian princes must look to the interest of their government, so especially must they consider the interests of christianity, and not call every redargution or modest discovery of an established error by the name of disturbance of the peace. For it is very likely that the peevishness and impatience of contradiction in the governors may break the peace. Let them remember but the gentleness of christianity, the liberty of consciences which ought to be preserved, and let them do justice to the persons whoever they are that are peevish, provided no man's person be overborne with prejudice. For if it be necessary for all men to subscribe to the present established religion, by the same reason at another time a man may be bound to subscribe to the contradictory, and so to all religions in the world. And they only who by their too much confidence entitle God to all their fancies, and make them to be questions of religion, and evidences for heaven or consignations to hell, they only think this doctrine unreasonable, and they are the men that first disturb the church's peace, and then think there is no appeasing the tumult but by getting the victory. But they that consider things wisely, understand that since salvation and damnation depend not upon impertinencies, and yet that public peace and tranquillity may, the prince is in this case to seek how to secure government, and the issues and intentions of that, while there is in these cases directly no insecurity to religion unless by the accidental uncharitableness of them that dispute: which uncharitableness is also much prevented when the public peace is secured, and no person is on either side engaged upon revenge[q], or troubled with disgrace, or

[q] Dextera præcipue capit indulgentia mentes;
Asperitas odium sævaque bella parit.
[Ovid. Art. amat. ii. 145.—'bella movet,'—'bella movent,'—'verba movent,' MSS.]

vexed with punishments by any decretory sentence against him. It was the saying of a wise statesman, I mean Thuanus, *Hæretici qui pace data factionibus scinduntur, persecutione uniuntur contra rempublicam.* If you persecute heretics or discrepants, they unite themselves as to a common defence; if you permit them, they divide themselves upon private interests, and the rather if this interest was an ingredient of the opinion[r].

5. The sum is this: it concerns the duty of a prince, because it concerns the honour of God, that all vices and every part of ill life be discountenanced and restrained; and therefore in relation to that, opinions are to be dealt with. For the understanding being to direct the will, and opinions to guide our practices, they are considerable only as they teach impiety and vice, as they either dishonour God or disobey Him. Now all such doctrines are to be condemned: but for the persons preaching such doctrines, if they neither justify nor approve the pretended consequences which are certainly impious, they are to be separated from that consideration; but if they know such consequences and allow them, or if they do not stay till the doctrines produce impiety, but take sin beforehand, and manage them impiously in any sense, or if either themselves or their doctrine do really, and without colour or feigned pretext, disturb the public peace and just interests[s], they are not to be suffered. In all other cases it is not only lawful to permit them, but it is also necessary that princes and all in authority should not persecute discrepant opinions. And in such cases wherein persons not otherwise incompetent are bound to reprove an error (as they are in many) in all these if the prince makes restraint, he hinders men from doing their duty, and from obeying the laws of Jesus Christ.

§ 17. Of compliance with disagreeing persons or weak consciences in general.

1. Upon these grounds it remains that we reduce this doctrine to practical conclusions, and consider among the differing sects and opinions which trouble these parts of christendom and come into our concernment, which sects of Christians are to be tolerated and how far: and which are to be restrained and punished in their several proportions.

2. The first consideration is, that[t] since diversity of opinions does more concern public peace than religion, what is to be done to persons who disobey a public sanction upon a true allegation that they cannot believe it to be lawful to obey such constitutions, although

[r] [cf. epist. dedic., p. 352 supra.]

[s] Extat prudens monitum Mecænatis apud Dionem Cassium [lib. lii. p. 490 D.] ad Augustum in hæc verba, 'Eos vero qui in divinis aliquid innovant, odio habe, et coerce, non deorum solum causa, . . sed quia nova numina hi tales introducentes multos impellunt ad mutationem rerum: unde conjurationes, seditiones, conciliabula exsistunt, res profecto minime conducibiles principatui.' Et legibus quoque expressum est, Quod in religionem committitur in omnium fertur injuriam.

[t] ['that' om. C.]

they disbelieve them upon insufficient grounds; that is, whether *in constituta lege* disagreeing persons or weak consciences are to be complied withal, and their disobeying and disagreeing tolerated.

3. First, in this question there is no distinction can be made between persons truly weak, and but pretending so. For all that pretend to it are to be allowed the same liberty, whatsoever it be; for no man's spirit is known to any but to God and himself, and therefore pretences and realities in this case are both alike in order to the public toleration. And this very thing is one argument to persuade a negative. For the chief thing in this case is the concernment of public government, which is then most of all violated when what may prudently be permitted to some purposes may be demanded to many more, and the piety of the laws abused to the impiety of other men's ends. And if laws be made so malleable as to comply with weak consciences, he that hath a mind to disobey is made impregnable against the coercitive power of the law by this pretence. For a weak conscience signifies nothing in this case but a dislike of the law upon a contrary persuasion. For if some weak consciences do obey the law, and others do not, it is not their weakness indefinitely that is the cause of it, but a definite and particular persuasion to the contrary. So that if such a pretence be excuse sufficient from obeying, then the law is a sanction obliging every one to obey that hath a mind to it, and he that hath not may choose; that is, it is no law at all, for he that hath a mind to it may do it if there be no law, and he that hath no mind to it need not for all the law.

4. And therefore the wit of man cannot prudently frame a law of that temper and expedient, but either he must lose the formality of a law, and neither have power coercitive nor obligatory but *ad arbitrium inferiorum;* or else it cannot, antecedently to the particular case, give leave to any sort of men to disagree or disobey.

5. Secondly, suppose that a law be made with great reason, so as to satisfy divers persons pious and prudent that it complies with the necessity of government, and promotes the interest of God's service and public order; it may easily be imagined that these persons which are obedient sons of the church may be as zealous for the public order and discipline of the church as others for their opinion against it, and may be as much scandalized if disobedience be tolerated as others are if the law be exacted; and what shall be done in this case? Both sorts of men cannot be complied withal: because as these pretend to be offended at the law, and by consequence (if they understand the consequents of their own opinion) at them that obey the law; so the others are justly offended at them that unjustly disobey it. If therefore there be any on the right side as confident and zealous as they who are on the wrong side, then the disagreeing persons are not to be complied with to avoid giving offence: for if they be, offence is given to better persons; and so the mischief which such

complying seeks to prevent is made greater and more unjust, obedience is discouraged, and disobedience is legally canonized for the result of a holy and a tender conscience.

6. Thirdly, such complying with the disagreeings of a sort of men is the total overthrow of all discipline, and it is better to make no laws of public worship than to rescind them in the very constitution, and there can be no end in making the sanction but to make the law ridiculous and the authority contemptible. For to say that complying with weak consciences in the very framing of a law of discipline is the way to preserve unity, were all one as to say, To take away all laws is the best way to prevent disobedience. In such matters of indifferency, the best way of cementing the fraction is to unite the parts in the authority; for then the question is but one, viz., whether the authority must be obeyed or not. But if a permission be given of disputing the particulars, the questions become next to infinite. A mirror when it is broken represents the object multiplied and divided; but if it be entire, and through one centre transmits the species to the eye, the vision is one and natural. Laws are the mirror in which men are to dress and compose their actions, and therefore must not be broken with such clauses of exception, which may without remedy be abused to the prejudice of authority, and peace, and all human sanctions. And I have known in some churches that this pretence hath been nothing but a design to discredit the law, to dismantle the authority that made it, to raise their own credit and a trophy of their zeal, to make it a characteristic note of a sect and the cognizance of holy persons: and yet the men that claimed exemption from the laws upon pretence of having weak consciences[u], if in hearty expression you had told them so to their heads, they would have spit in your face, and were so far from confessing themselves weak, that they thought themselves able to give laws to christendom, to instruct the greatest clerks, and to catechize the church herself. And which is the worst of all, they who were perpetually clamorous that the severity of the laws should slacken as to their particular, and in matter adiaphorous (in which, if the church hath any authority, she hath power to make laws) to indulge a leave to them to do as they list, yet were the most imperious amongst men, most decretory in their sentences, and most impatient of any disagreeing from them though in the least minute and particular: whereas by all the justice of the world, they who persuade such a compliance in matters of fact and of so little question, should not deny to tolerate persons that differ in questions of great difficulty and contestation.

7. Fourthly, but yet since all things almost in the world have been made matters of dispute, and the will of some men, and the malice of others, and the infinite industry and pertinacy of contest-

[u] [That 'no man can say concerning himself that he is scandalized at another,' is shewn with great clearness by Taylor in another place.—'Life of Christ,' part iii. sect. 14. disc. xvii. num. 10. vol. ii. p. 580.]

ing, and resolution to conquer, hath abused some persons innocently into a persuasion that even the laws themselves, though never so prudently constituted, are superstitious or impious; such persons who are otherwise pious, humble, and religious, are not to be destroyed for such matters which in themselves are not of concernment to salvation, and neither are so accidentally to such men and in such cases where they are innocently abused, and they err without purpose and design. And therefore if there be a public disposition in some persons to dislike laws of a certain quality, if it be foreseen, it is to be considered *in lege dicenda;* and whatever inconvenience or particular offence is foreseen, is either to be directly avoided in the law, or else a compensation in the excellency of the law, and certain advantages, made to outweigh their pretensions. But *in lege jam dicta,* because there may be a necessity some persons should have a liberty indulged them, it is necessary that the governors of the church should be intrusted with a power to consider the particular case, and indulge a liberty to the person, and grant personal dispensations. This I say is to be done at several times, upon particular instance, upon singular consideration, and new emergencies. But that a whole kind of men, such a kind to which all men without possibility of being confuted may pretend, should at once in the very frame of the law be permitted to disobey, is to nullify the law, to destroy discipline, and to hallow disobedience; it takes away the obliging part of the law, and makes that the thing enacted shall not be enjoined but tolerated only; it destroys unity and uniformity, which to preserve was the very end of such laws of discipline; it bends the rule to the thing which is to be ruled, so that the law obeys the subject, not the subject the law: it is to make a law for particulars, not upon general reason and congruity, against the prudence and design of all laws in the world, and absolutely without the example of any church in christendom; it prevents no scandal, for some will be scandalized at the authority itself, some at the complying and remissness of discipline, and several men at matters and upon ends contradictory: all which cannot, some ought not, to be complied withal.

8. Sixthly, the sum is this; the end of the laws of discipline are in an immediate order to the conservation and ornament of the public; and therefore the laws must not so tolerate, as by conserving persons to destroy themselves and the public benefit: but if there be cause for it they must be cassated; or if there be no sufficient cause, the complyings must be so as may best preserve the particulars in conjunction with the public end, which because it is primarily intended is of greatest consideration. But the particulars whether of case or person are to be considered occasionally and emergently by the judges, but cannot antecedently and regularly be determined by a law.

---

9. But this sort of men is of so general pretence, that all laws

and all judges may easily be abused by them. Those sects which are signified by a name, which have a system of articles, a body of profession, may be more clearly determined in their question concerning the lawfulness of permitting their professions and assemblies. I shall instance in two, which are most troublesome and most disliked, and by an account made of these we may make judgment what may be done towards others whose errors are not apprehended of so great malignity. The men I mean are the Anabaptists and the Papists.

§ 18. A particular consideration of the opinions of the Anabaptists.

1. In the Anabaptists I consider only their two capital opinions, the one against the baptism of infants, the other against magistracy: and because they produce different judgments and various effects, all their other fancies, which vary as the moon does, may stand or fall in their proportion and likeness to these.

2. And first I consider their denying baptism to infants. Although it be a doctrine justly condemned by the most sorts of Christians upon great grounds of reason, yet possibly their defence may be so great as to take off much, and rebate the edge of their adversaries' assault. It will be neither unpleasant nor unprofitable to draw a short scheme of plea for each party; the result of which possibly may be, that though they be deceived, yet they have so great excuse on their side that their error is not impudent or vincible.—The baptism of infants rests principally and usually[v] upon this discourse;—

3. When God made a covenant with Abraham for himself and his posterity, into which the gentiles were reckoned by spiritual adoption, He did for the present consign that covenant with the sacrament of circumcision. The extent of which rite was to all his family, from the *major domo* to the *proselytus domicilio* and to infants of eight days old. Now the very nature of this covenant being a covenant of faith for its formality, and with all faithful people for the object, and circumcision being a seal of this covenant, if ever any rite do supervene to consign the same covenant, that rite must acknowledge circumcision for its type and precedent. And this the apostle tells us in express doctrine. Now the nature of a type[w] is, to give some proportions to its successor the antitype; and they both being seals of the same righteousness of faith, it will not easily be found where these two seals have any such distinction in their nature or purposes as to appertain to persons of differing capacity, and not equally concern all. And this argument was thought of so much force by some of those excellent men which were bishops in the primitive church, that a good bishop[x] writ an epistle to S. Cyprian to know of him whether or no it were lawful to baptize infants before the eighth day, because the type of baptism was ministered in that circumcision; he in his discourse supposing that the first rite was a

[v] ['rests wholly' A.] [w] ['of types' A, B.] [x] [vid. p. 545 infra.]

direction to the second, which prevailed with him so far as to believe it to limit every circumstance.

4. And not only this type, but the acts of Christ which were previous to the institution of baptism, did prepare our understanding by such impresses as were sufficient to produce such persuasion in us, that Christ intended this ministry for the actual advantage of infants as well as of persons of understanding. For Christ commanded that children should be brought unto Him, He took them in His arms, He imposed hands on them and blessed them; and without question did by such acts of favour consign His love to them, and them to a capacity of an eternal participation of it. And possibly the invitation which Christ made to all to come to Him, all them that are heavy laden, did in its proportion concern infants as much as others, if they be guilty of original sin, and if that sin be a burden, and presses them to any spiritual danger or inconvenience. And if they be not, yet Christ, who was (as Tertullian's[y] phrase is) *nullius pœnitentiæ debitor*, guilty of no sin, 'obliged to no repentance,' needing no purification and no pardon, was baptized by S. John's baptism, which was the baptism of repentance[z]. And it is all the reason of[a] the world that since the grace of Christ is as large as the prevarication of Adam, all they who are made guilty by the first Adam should be cleansed by the second. But as they are guilty by another man's act, so they should be brought to the font to be purified by others: there being the same proportion of reason that by others' acts they should be relieved, who were in danger of perishing by the act of others. And therefore S. Austin[b] argues excellently to this purpose, *Accommodat illis mater ecclesia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur; ut quoniam quod ægri sunt alio peccante prægravantur, sic cum hi sani sunt, alio . . confitente salventur.* And Justin Martyr[c], Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν [τὰ βρέφη] τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

5. But whether they have original sin or no, yet take them *in puris naturalibus*, they cannot go to God, or attain to eternity, to which they were intended in their first being and creation: and therefore much less since their naturals are impaired by the curse on human nature procured by Adam's prevarication; and if a natural agent cannot *in puris naturalibus* attain to heaven, which is a supernatural end, much less when it is loaden with accidental and grievous impediments. Now then since the only way revealed to us of acquiring heaven is by Jesus Christ, and the first inlet into christianity and access to Him is by baptism, as appears by the perpetual analogy of the New testament; either infants are not persons capable of that end which is the perfection of human nature, and to which the soul

[y] [De bapt., cap. xii. p. 229 A.]
[z] ['And if . . . repentance,' deest A.]
[a] ['in' C.]
[b] Serm. x. de verb. apost. [al. serm. clxxvi. cap. 2. tom. v. col. 840.]
[c] Resp. ad Orthod. [qu. lvi. p. 462.]

of man in its being made immortal was essentially designed, and so are miserable and deficient from the very end of humanity if they die before the use of reason; or else they must be brought to Christ by the church doors, that is, by the font and waters of baptism.

6. And in reason it seems more pregnant and plausible that infants rather than men of understanding should be baptized. For since the efficacy of the sacraments depends upon divine institution and immediate benediction, and that they produce their effects independently upon man, in them that do not hinder their operation; since infants cannot by any act of their own promote the hope of their own salvation, which men of reason and choice may, by acts of virtue and election; it is more agreeable to the goodness of God, the honour and excellency of the sacrament, and the necessity of its institution, that it should in infants supply the want of human acts and free obedience: which the very thing itself seems to say it does, because its effect is from God, and requires nothing on man's part but that its efficacy be not hindered. And then in infants the disposition is equal, and the necessity more; they cannot *ponere obicem*, and by the same reason cannot do other acts which without the sacraments do advantages towards our hopes of heaven, and therefore have more need to be supplied by an act and an institution divine and supernatural.

7. And this is not only necessary in respect of the condition of infants' incapacity to do acts of grace, but also in obedience to divine precept. For Christ made a law whose sanction is with an exclusive negative to them that are not baptized, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven[d]." If then infants have a capacity of being coheirs with Christ in the kingdom of His Father, as Christ affirms they have by saying, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven[e];" then there is a necessity that they should be brought to baptism, there being an absolute exclusion of all persons unbaptized, and all persons not spiritual, from the kingdom of heaven.

8. But indeed it is a destruction of all the hopes and happiness of infants, a denying to them an exemption from the final condition of beasts and insectiles, or else a designing of them to a worse misery, to say that God hath not appointed some external or internal means of bringing them to an eternal happiness. Internal they have none, for grace being an improvement and heightening the faculties of nature in order to a heightened and supernatural end, grace hath no influence or efficacy upon their faculties who can do no natural acts of understanding; and if there be no external means, then they are destitute of all hopes and possibilities of salvation.

9. But thanks be to God, He hath provided better, and told us accordingly, for He hath made a promise of the Holy Ghost to infants as well as to men: "The promise is made to you and to your chil-

[d] [John iii. 5.] [e] [Matt. xix. 14.]

dren," said S. Peter[f], 'the promise of the Father,' the promise that He would 'send the Holy Ghost.' Now if you ask how this promise shall be conveyed to our children, we have an express out of the same sermon of S. Peter, "Be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." So that therefore because the Holy Ghost is promised, and baptism is the means of receiving the promise, therefore baptism pertains to them to whom the promise, which is the effect of baptism, does appertain. And that we may not think this argument is fallible or of human collection, observe that it is the argument of the same apostle in express terms; for in the case of Cornelius and his family, he justified his proceeding by this very medium, "Shall we deny baptism to them who have received the gift of the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Which discourse if it be reduced to form of argument, says this; they that are capable of the same grace are receptive of the same sign: but then (to make the syllogism up with an assumption proper to our present purpose) infants are capable of the same grace, that is, of the Holy Ghost (for 'the promise is' made 'to our children' as well as to us, and S. Paul says 'the children of believing parents are holy,' and therefore have the Holy Ghost, who is the fountain of holiness and sanctification) therefore they are to receive the sign and the seal of it, that is, the sacrament of baptism.

10. And indeed since God entered a covenant with the Jews which did also actually involve their children, and gave them a sign to establish the covenant and its appendent promise, either God does not so much love the church as He did the synagogue, and the mercies of the gospel are more restrained than the mercies of the law, God having made a covenant with the infants of Israel and none with the children of christian parents; or if He hath, yet we want the comfort of its consignation; and unless our children are to be baptized, and so entitled to the promises of the new covenant as the Jewish babes were by circumcision, this mercy which appertains to infants is so secret and undeclared and unconsigned, that we want much of that mercy and outward testimony which gave them comfort and assurance.

11. And in proportion to these precepts and revelations was the practice apostolical: for they (to whom Christ gave in precept to "make disciples all nations, baptizing them," and knew that nations without children never were, and that therefore they were passively concerned in that commission) baptized whole families, particularly that of Stephanas and divers others, in which it is more than probable there were some minors if not sucking babes. And this practice did descend upon the church in after ages by tradition apostolical. Of this we have sufficient testimony from Origen[g], *Pro hoc ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare;* and S. Austin[h], *Hoc ecclesia a majorum fide per-*

[f] [Acts ii. 38, 39; i. 4.]

[g] In Rom. vi. tom. ii. p. 543. [tom. v. p. 565.]

[h] Serm. x. de verb. apost. c. 2. [p. 541. not. a, supra.]

cepit. And generally all writers (as Calvin[1] says) affirm the same thing, for *nullus est scriptor tam vetustus qui non ejus originem ad apostolorum sæculum pro certo referat.* From hence the conclusion is that infants ought to be baptized, that it is simply necessary, that they who deny it are heretics; and such are not to be endured, because they deny to infants hopes, and take away the possibility of their salvation, which is revealed to us on no other condition of which they are capable but baptism. For by the insinuation of the type, by the action of Christ, by the title infants have to heaven, by the precept of the gospel, by the energy of the promise, by the reasonableness of the thing, by the infinite necessity on the infants' part, by the practice apostolical, by their tradition and the universal practice of the church. by all these God and good people proclaim the lawfulness, the conveniency, and the necessity, of infants' baptism.

12. To all this the anabaptist gives a soft and gentle answer,—That it is a goodly harangue which upon strict examination will come to nothing; that it pretends fairly and signifies little; that some of these allegations are false, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient.

13. For the argument from circumcision is invalid upon infinite considerations. Figures and types prove nothing unless a commandment go along with them, or some express to signify such to be their purpose. For the deluge of waters and the ark of Noah were a figure of baptism, said Peter; and if therefore the circumstances of one should be drawn to the other, we should make baptism a prodigy rather than a rite. The paschal lamb was a type of the eucharist, which succeeds the other as baptism does to circumcision; but because there was in the manducation of the paschal lamb no prescription of sacramental drink, shall we thence conclude that the eucharist is to be ministered but in one kind? And even in the very instance of this argument, supposing a correspondence of analogy between circumcision and baptism, yet there is no correspondence of identity. For although it were granted that both of them did consign the covenant of faith, yet there is nothing in the circumstance of children's being circumcised that so concerns that mystery but that it might very well be given to children, and yet baptism only to men of reason. Because circumcision left a character in the flesh, which being imprinted upon infants, did its work to them when they came to age; and such a character was necessary, because there was no word added to the sign: but baptism imprints nothing that remains on the body; and if it leaves a character at all, it is upon the soul, to which also the word is added, which is as much a part of the sacrament as the sign itself is. For both which reasons it is requisite that the persons baptized should be capable of reason, that they may be capable both of the word of

[1] 4 Inst. cap. 16. sect. 8. [p. 357. fol. Amstel. 1667.]

the sacrament, and the impress made upon the spirit. Since therefore the reason of this parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying in this circumstance of age any more than in the other annexes of the type. And the case is clear in the bishop's question to Cyprian[j]; for why shall not infants be baptized just upon the eighth day as well as circumcised? If the correspondence of the rites be an argument to infer one circumstance which is impertinent and accidental to the mysteriousness of the rite, why shall it not infer all? And then also females must not be baptized, because they were not circumcised. But it were more proper, if we would understand it right, to prosecute the analogy from the type to the antitype by way of letter, and spirit, and signification; and as circumcision figures baptism, so also the adjuncts of the circumcision shall signify something spiritual in the adherences of baptism. And therefore as infants were circumcised, so spiritual infants shall be baptized, which is spiritual circumcision: for therefore babes had the ministry of the type, to signify that we must, when we give our names to Christ, become νήπιοι ἐν πονηρίᾳ[k], 'children in malice;' for "unless you become like one of these little ones, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," said our blessed Saviour[l]; and then the type is made complete. And this seems to have been the sense of the primitive church; for in the age next to the apostles they gave to all baptized persons milk and honey[m], to represent to them their duty, that though in age and understanding they were men, yet they were babes in Christ, and children in malice. But to infer the sense of the pædo-baptists is so weak a manner of arguing, that Austin, whose device it was (and men use to be in love with their own fancies) at the most pretended it but as probable and a mere conjecture.

14. And as ill success will they have with the other arguments as with this. For from the action of Christ's blessing infants to infer that they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much as that there is great want of better arguments. The conclusion would be with more probability derived thus; Christ blessed children and so dismissed them, but baptized them not; therefore infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weak as its enemy, yet that Christ did not baptize them is an argument sufficient that Christ hath other ways of bringing them to heaven than by baptism, He passed His act of grace upon them by benediction and imposition of hands.

15. And therefore although neither infants nor any man *in puris naturalibus* can attain to a supernatural end without the addition of some instrument or means of God's appointing ordinarily and regularly; yet where God hath not appointed a rule nor an order, as in

[j] Lib. iii. epist. 8. ad Fidum. [al. ep. lxiv. p. 159.]
[k] [1 Cor. xiv. 20.]
[l] [Matt. xviii. 3.]
[m] [See authorities in Bingham, Antiq., book xii. chap. 4. § 6.]

the case of infants we contend He hath not, the argument is invalid. And as we are sure that God hath not commanded infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help.

16. And therefore let them be pressed with all the inconveniences that are consequent to original sin, yet either it will not be laid to the charge of infants so as to be sufficient to condemn them; or if it could, yet the mercy and absolute goodness of God will secure them, if He takes them away before they can glorify Him with a free obedience. *Quid ergo festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?* was the question of Tertullian[n]. He knew no such danger from their original guilt as to drive them to a laver of which in that age of innocence they had no need, as he conceived. And therefore there is no necessity of flying to the help of others for tongue, and heart, and faith, and predispositions to baptism: for what need all this stir? As infants without their own consent, without any act of their own, and without any exterior solennity, contracted the guilt of Adam's sin, and so are liable to all the punishment which can with justice descend upon his posterity, who are personally innocent; so infants shall be restored without any solennity or act of their own, or of any other men for them, by the second Adam, by the redemption of Jesus Christ, by His righteousness and mercies applied either immediately, or how or when He shall be pleased to appoint. And so Austin's argument will come to nothing, without any need of godfathers, or the faith of any body else. And it is too narrow a conception of God almighty, because He hath tied us to the observation of the ceremonies of His own institution, that therefore He hath tied Himself to it. Many thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable soul to Himself: but nothing is more unreasonable than because He hath tied all men of years and discretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads shall carry infants to Him that way without His direction. The conceit is poor and low, and the action consequent to it is too bold and venturous: *Mysterium meum mihi et filiis domus meæ;* let Him do what He please to infants, we must not.

17. Only this is certain, that God hath as great care of infants as of others; and because they have no capacity of doing such acts as may be in order to acquiring salvation, God will by His own immediate mercy bring them thither where He hath intended them; but to say that therefore He will do it by an external act and ministry, and that confined to a particular, viz., this rite and no other, is no good argument unless God could not do it without such means, or that He had said He would not. And why cannot God as well do His mercies to infants now immediately, as He did before the institution either of circumcision or baptism?

18. However, there is no danger that infants should perish for

[n] De Baptism. [cap. xviii. p. 231 D.]

want of this external ministry, much less for prevaricating Christ's precepts of *Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.* For first, the water and the Spirit in this place signify the same thing; and by water is meant the effect of the Spirit, cleansing and purifying the soul, as appears in its parallel place of Christ 'baptizing with the Spirit and with fire.' For although this was literally fulfilled in Pentecost, yet morally there is more in it, for it is the sign of the effect of the Holy Ghost and His productions upon the soul; and it was an excellency of our blessed Saviour's office that He baptizes ALL that come to Him with the Holy Ghost and with fire: for so S. John, preferring Christ's mission and office before his own, tells the Jews, not Christ's disciples, that Christ shall baptize them with fire and the Holy Spirit, that is, all that come to Him, as John the baptist did with water; for so lies the antithesis. And you may as well conclude that infants must also pass through the fire as through the water. And that we may not think this a trick to elude the pressure of this place, Peter[o] says the same thing; for when he had said that baptism saves us, he adds by way of explication, 'not the washing of the flesh, but the confidence of a good conscience towards God;' plainly saying that it is not water or the purifying of the body, but the cleansing of the Spirit, that does that which is supposed to be the effect of baptism. And if our Saviour's exclusive negative be expounded by analogy to this of Peter, as certainly the other parallel instance must, and this may, then it will be so far from proving the necessity of infants' baptism, that it can conclude for no man that he is obliged to the rite; and the doctrine of the baptism is only to derive from the very words of institution, and not be forced from words which were spoken before it was ordained. But to let pass this advantage, and to suppose it meant of external baptism, yet this no more infers a necessity of infants' baptism than the other words of Christ infer a necessity to give them the holy communion, *nisi comederitis carnem filii hominis et biberitis sanguinem, non introibitis in regnum cœlorum;* and yet we do not think these words sufficient argument to communicate them. If men therefore will do us justice, either let them give both sacraments to infants, as some ages of the church did, or neither. For the wit of man is not able to shew a disparity in the sanction, or in the energy of its expression. And Simeon Thessalonicensis[p] derides *inertem Latinorum* λεπτολογίαν, as we express it 'the lazy trifling of the Latins,' who dream of a difference: βαβαὶ τῆς ἀλογίας ἅμα καὶ ἀτοπίας· καὶ διὰ τί βαπτίζεις; 'O the unreasonableness and absurdity! For why do you baptize

[o] [1 Pet. iii. 21.]

[p] [Symeon Thessalonicensis, 'De sacramentis eucharistiæ et confirmatione;' cited by Petrus Arcudius, 'De concordia ecclesiæ occidentalis et orientalis in septem sacramentorum administratione,' lib. i. p. 40. fol. Lut. Par. 1626.—For an account of Symeon and his work, which has never been printed entire, see Morinus, 'Antiqui pœnitentiales,' p. 125. fol. Bruxell. 1685: and Cave, Hist. Lit. ad A.D. 1418. tom. ii. append. p. 114. fol. Oxon. 1743.—'And Simeon . . impediment in both,' deest A.]

them?' Meaning that because they are equally ignorant in baptism as in the eucharist, that which hinders them in one is the same impediment in both. And therefore they were honest that understood the obligation to be parallel, and performed it accordingly; and yet because we say they were deceived in one instance, and yet the obligation (all the world cannot reasonably say but) is the same, they are as honest and as reasonable that do neither. And since the ancient church did with an equal opinion of a necessity give them the communion, and yet men now-a-days do not, why shall men be more[q] burdened with a prejudice and a name of obloquy for not giving the infants one sacrament more than they are disliked for not affording them the other? If 'anabaptist' shall be a name of disgrace, why shall not some other name be invented for them that deny to communicate infants which shall be equally disgraceful, or else both the opinions signified by such names be accounted no disparagement, but receive their estimate according to their truth?

19. Of which truth since we are now taking account from pretences of scripture, it is considerable that the discourse of S. Peter which is pretended for the entitling infants to the promise of the Holy Ghost, and by consequence to baptism which is supposed to be its instrument and conveyance, is wholly a fancy, and hath in it nothing of certainty or demonstration, and not much probability. For besides that the thing itself is unreasonable, and the Holy Ghost works by the heightening and improving our natural faculties, and therefore it is a promise that so concerns them as they are reasonable creatures, and may have a title to it in proportion to their nature, but no possession or reception of it till their faculties come into act; besides this, I say, the words mentioned in S. Peter's sermon (which are the only record of the promise) are interpreted upon a weak mistake. "The promise belongs to you and to your children," therefore infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity; that's the argument. But the reason of it is not yet discovered, nor ever will; for "to you and your children" is to you and your posterity, to you and your children when they are of the same capacity in which you are effectually receptive of the promise; and therefore Tertullian[r] calls infants *designatos sanctitatis ac per hoc etiam salutis*, 'the candidates of holiness and salvation, those that are designed to it[s].' But he that whenever the word 'children' is used in scripture shall by 'children' understand infants, must needs believe that in all Israel there were no men but all were infants; and if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder they should overcome the Anakims, and beat the king of Moab, and march so far, and discourse so well; for they were all called the 'children of Israel.'

20. And for the allegation of S. Paul that infants are holy if their

[q] ['more' om. C.]

[r] [De anima, cap. xxxix. (sed leg. 'sanctitati,' 'saluti.')—Vid. etiam S. Hieron. epist. lvii. ad Lætam, tom. iv. part. 2. col. 590.]

[s] ['and therefore . . to it,' deest A.]

parents be faithful, it signifies nothing but that they are holy by designation, just as Jeremy and John baptist were sanctified in their mother's womb, that is, they were appointed and designed for holy ministries, but had not received the promise of the Father, the gift of the Holy Ghost, for all that sanctification; and just so the children of christian parents are sanctified, that is, designed to the service of Jesus Christ and the future participation of the promises.

21. And as the promise appertains not (for aught appears) to infants in that capacity and consistence, but only by the title of their being reasonable creatures, and when they come to that act of which by nature they have the faculty; so if it did, yet baptism is not the means of conveying the Holy Ghost. For that which S. Peter says, "Be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost," signifies no more than this: First be baptized, and then by imposition of the apostles' hands (which was another mystery and rite) ye shall receive the promise of the Father: and this is nothing but an insinuation of the rite of confirmation[t], as is to this sense expounded by divers ancient authors; and in ordinary ministry the effect of it is not bestowed upon any unbaptized persons, for it is in order next after baptism: and upon this ground Peter's argument in the case of Cornelius was concluding enough *a majori ad minus;* thus the Holy Ghost was bestowed upon him and his family, which gift by ordinary ministry was consequent to baptism, (not as the effect is to the cause or to the proper instrument, but as a consequent is to an antecedent in a chain of causes accidentally and by positive institution depending upon each other;) God by that miracle did give testimony that the persons of the men were in great dispositions towards heaven, and therefore were to be admitted to those rites which are the ordinary inlets into the kingdom of heaven. But then from hence to argue that wherever there is a capacity of receiving the same grace, there also the same sign is to be ministered, and from hence to infer pædobaptism, is an argument very fallacious upon several grounds. First, because baptism is not the sign of the Holy Ghost, but by another mystery it was conveyed ordinarily, and extraordinarily it was conveyed independently from any mystery; and so the argument goes upon a wrong supposition. Secondly, if the supposition were true, the proposition built upon it is false; for they that are capable of the same grace are not always capable of the same sign: for women under the law of Moses, although they were capable of the righteousness of faith, yet they were not capable of the sign of circumcision. For God does not always convey His graces in the same manner, but to some mediately, to others immediately; and there is no better instance in the world of it than the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is the thing now instanced in this contestation; for it is certain in scripture that it was ordinarily given by imposition of hands, and that after baptism, (and when this came into an ordinary ministry, it was

[t] [See Treatise on Confirmation, infra.]

called by the ancient church Chrism or Confirmation;) but yet it was given sometimes without imposition of hands, as at Pentecost, and to the family of Cornelius; sometimes before baptism, sometimes after, sometimes in conjunction with it.

22. And after all this, lest these arguments should not ascertain their cause, they fall on complaining against God, and will not be content with God unless they may baptize their children, but take exceptions that God did more for the children of the Jews. But why so? Because God made a covenant with their children actually as infants, and consigned it by circumcision. Well; so He did with our children too in their proportion. He made a covenant of spiritual promises on His part, and spiritual and real services on ours; and this pertains to children when they are capable, but made with them as soon as they are alive, and yet not so as with the Jews' babes: for as their rite consigned them actually, so it was a national and temporal blessing and covenant, as a separation of them from the portion of the nations, a marking them for a peculiar people; and therefore while they were in the wilderness and separate from the commixture of all people, they were not at all circumcised; but as that rite did seal the righteousness of faith, so by virtue of its adherency and remanency in their flesh it did that work when the children came to age. But in christian infants, the case is otherwise: for the new covenant, being established upon better promises, is not only to better purposes, but also in distinct manner to be understood; when their spirits are as receptive of a spiritual act or impress as the bodies of Jewish children were of the sign of circumcision, then it is to be consigned. But this business is quickly at an end, by saying that God hath done no less for ours than for their children; for He will do the mercies of a father and creator to them, and He did no more to the other. But He hath done more to ours, for He hath made a covenant with them, and built it upon promises of the greatest concernment; He did not so to them. But then for the other part which is the main of the argument, that unless this mercy be consigned by baptism, as good not at all in respect of us, because we want the comfort of it; this is the greatest vanity in the world. For when God hath made a promise pertaining also to our children (for so our adversaries contend, and we also acknowledge in its true sense) shall not this promise, this word of God, be of sufficient truth, certainty, and efficacy, to cause comfort, unless we tempt God and require a sign of Him? May not Christ say to these men as sometime to the Jews, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, but no sign shall be given unto it?" But the truth on't is, this argument is nothing but a direct quarrelling with God almighty.

23. Now since there is no strength in the doctrinal part, the practice and precedents apostolical and ecclesiastical will be of less concernment, if they were true as is pretended; because actions

apostolical are not always rules for ever: it might be fit for them to do it *pro loco et tempore*, as divers others of their institutions, but yet no engagement passed thence upon following ages; for it might be convenient at that time, in the new spring of christianity and till they had engaged a considerable party, by that means to make them parties against the gentiles' superstition, and by way of preoccupation, to ascertain them to their own sect when they came to be men; or for some other reason not transmitted to us, because the question of fact itself is not sufficiently determined. For the insinuation of that precept of baptizing all nations, of which children certainly are a part, does as little advantage as any of the rest, because other parallel expressions of scripture do determine and expound themselves to a sense that includes not all persons absolutely, but of a capable condition; as *Adorate eum omnes gentes, et psallite Deo omnes nationes terræ*, and divers more.

24. As for the conjecture concerning the family of Stephanas, at the best it is but a conjecture; and besides that it is not proved that there were children in the family, yet if that were granted it follows not that they were baptized; because by 'whole families' in scripture is meant all persons of reason and age within the family. For it is said of the ruler at Capernaum[u], that "he believed and all his house;" now you may also suppose that in his house were little babes, that is likely enough; and you may suppose that they did believe too before they could understand, but that's not so likely: and then the argument from baptizing of Stephanas' household may be allowed just as probable. But this is unmanlike, to build upon such slight airy conjectures.

25. But tradition by all means must supply the place of scripture, and there is pretended a tradition apostolical that infants were baptized. But at this we are not much moved; for we who rely upon the written word of God as sufficient to establish all true religion, do not value the allegation of traditions: and however the world goes, none of the reformed churches can pretend this argument against this opinion, because they who reject tradition when it is against them, must not pretend it at all for them. But if we should allow the topic to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as it can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the testimony of Origen, for from him Austin had it. For as for the testimony pretended out of Justin Martyr, it is to no purpose; because the book from whence the words are cited, is not Justin's, who was before Origen, and yet he cites Origen and Irenæus: but who please may see it sufficiently condemned by Sixtus Senensis, *Biblioth. Sanct.* lib. iv. *verbo* '*Justinus*[v].' And as for the testimony of Origen, we know nothing of it, for every heretic and interested person did interpolate all his works so much that we cannot discern which are his and which not[x].

[u] [John iv. 53.] [v] [tom. i. p. 430.] [x] ['For as . . not,' deest A.]

Now a tradition apostolical, if it be not consigned with a fuller testimony than of one person whom all after ages have condemned of many errors, will obtain so little reputation amongst those who know that things have upon greater authority pretended to derive from the apostles and yet falsely, that it will be a great argument that he is credulous and weak that shall be determined by so weak probation in matters of so great concernment. And the truth of the business is, as there was no command of scripture to oblige children to the susception of it, so the necessity of pædo-baptism was not determined in the church till in the eighth age after Christ; but in the year 418, in the Milevitan council[y], a provincial of Africa, there was a canon made for pædo-baptism; never till then. I grant it was practised in Africa before that time, and they or some of them thought well of it; and though that be no argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever before pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a precept of the gospel. S. Austin was the first that ever preached it to be absolutely necessary, and it was in his heat and anger against Pelagius, who had warmed and chafed him so in that question that it made him innovate in other doctrines possibly of more concernment than this. And that although this was practised anciently in Africa, yet that it was without an opinion of necessity, and not often there, nor at all in other places, we have the testimony of the learned pædo-baptist Ludovicus Vives, who, in his Annotations upon S. Austin *De civit. Dei*, lib. i. c. 27[z], affirms *neminem nisi adultum antiquitus solere baptizari.*

26. But besides that the tradition cannot be proved to be apostolical, we have very good evidence from antiquity that it was the opinion of the primitive church that infants ought not to be baptized; and this is clear in the sixth canon of the council of Neocæsarea[a]. The words are these, Περὶ κυοφορούσης, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὁπότε βούλεται· οὐδὲν γὰρ .. κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ, διὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι· the sense is this, 'A woman with child may be baptized when she please, for her baptism concerns not the child.' The reason of the connexion of the parts of that canon is in the following words, 'Because every one in that confession is to give a demonstration of his own choice and election:' meaning plainly that if the baptism of the mother did also pass upon the child, it were not fit for a pregnant woman to receive baptism; because in that sacrament there being a confession of faith, which confession supposes understanding and free choice, it is not reasonable the child should be consigned with such a mystery, since it cannot do any act of choice or understanding. And to this purpose are the words of Balsamon[b]; speaking of this decree,

[y] [can. ii. tom. i. col. 1217.]
[z] [tom. i. p. 51. 8vo. 1596.]
[a] [tom. i. col. 283.]
[b] In compend. can. tit. 4. [vid. Balsam. et Aristen. in canon. supradict. apud Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 406 sq.—'And to this .. can choose,' deest A.]

and of infants unborn not to be baptized, he says, Οὐ δύναται φωτισθῆναι διὰ τὸ μηκέτι εἰς φῶς ἐλθεῖν, μηδὲ προαίρεσιν ἔχειν τῆς ὁμολογίας τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος· 'the unborn babe is not to be baptized, because he neither is come to light, nor can he make choice of the confession, that is, of the articles to be confessed in divine baptism.' To the same sense are the words of Zonaras[c], Ἔμβρυον χρήζει βαπτίσματος ὅτε προαιρεῖσθαι δυνήσεται, 'the embryo or unborn babe does then need baptism when he can choose.' The canon speaks reason, and it intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the church, of interrogating the catechumens concerning the articles of creed. Which is one argument that either they did not admit infants to baptism, or that they did prevaricate egregiously in asking questions of them who themselves knew were not capable of giving answer. But the former was the more probable, according to the testimony of Walafridus Strabo[d], *Notandum deinde primis temporibus illis solummodo baptismi gratiam dari solitam, qui et corporis et mentis integritate jam ad hoc pervenerant, ut scire et intelligere possent quid emolumenti in baptismo consequendum, quid confitendum atque credendum, quid postremo renatis in Christo esset servandum ;* 'it is to be noted that in those first times the grace of baptism was wont to be given to those only who by their integrity of mind and body were arrived to this, that they could know and understand what profit was to be had by baptism, what was to be confessed and believed in baptism, and what is the duty of them who are born again in Christ[e].'

27. But to supply their incapacity by the answer of a godfather is but the same unreasonableness acted with a worse circumstance, and there is no sensible account can be given of it[f]. For that which some imperfectly murmur concerning stipulations civil performed by tutors in the name of their pupils, is an absolute vanity. For what if by positive constitution of the Romans such solennities of law are required in all stipulations, and by indulgence are permitted in the case of a notable benefit accruing to minors, must God be tied, and christian religion transact her mysteries by proportion and compliance with the law of the Romans? I know God might if He would have appointed godfathers to give answer in behalf of the children, and to be fidejussors for them; but we cannot find any authority or ground that He hath; and if He had, then it is to be supposed He would have given them commission to have transacted the solennity with better circumstances, and given answers with more truth. For the question is asked of believing in the present. And if the godfathers

[c] [In eund. canon. Ubi supra, p. 407.]
[d] De rebus eccles. c. 26. [p. 965 A.]
[e] ['But the former .. in Christ,' deest, A.]
[f] Quidni necesse est (sic legit Franc. Junius in notis ad Tertul.) sponsores etiam periculo ingeri, qui [al. 'quia'] et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli?—Tertul., lib. de Bapt. cap. 18. [p. 231 C.—Sed revera apud Junium, sicut apud cæteros editores, 'Quid enim necesse est' &c.]

answer in the name of the child, "I do believe," it is notorious they speak false and ridiculously, for the infant is not capable of believing; and if he were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know his mind? And therefore Tertullian[g] gives advice that the baptism of infants should be deferred, till they could give an account of their faith. And the same also is the counsel of Gregory[h] bishop of Nazianzum, although he allows them to hasten it in case of necessity: for though his reason taught him what was fit, yet he was overborne with the practice and opinion of his age, which began to bear too violently upon him; and yet in another place he makes mention of some to whom baptism was not administered διὰ νηπιότητα, 'by reason of infancy.' To which if we add that the parents of S. Austin, S. Hierome, and S. Ambrose, although they were christian, yet did not baptize their children before they were thirty years of age; and S. Chrysostom who was instituted and bred up in religion by the famous and beloved bishop Meletius, was yet not baptized till after he was twenty years of age; and Gregory Nazianzen, though he was the son of a bishop, yet was not christened till he came to man's age[i], it will be very considerable in the example, and of great efficacy for destroying the supposed necessity or derivation from the apostles.

28. But however, it is against the perpetual analogy of Christ's doctrine to baptize infants: for besides that Christ never gave any precept to baptize them, nor ever Himself nor His apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them; all that either He or His apostles said concerning it requires such previous dispositions to baptism of which infants are not capable, and these are faith and repentance. And not to instance in those innumerable places that require faith before this sacrament, there needs no more but this one saying of our blessed Saviour, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned[j]:" plainly thus, Faith and baptism in conjunction will bring a man to heaven; but if he have not faith, baptism shall do him no good. So that if baptism be necessary then, so is faith, and much more: for want of faith damns absolutely; it is not said so of the want of baptism. Now if this decretory sentence be to be understood of persons of age, and if children by such an answer (which indeed is reasonable enough) be excused from the necessity of faith, the want of which regularly does damn; then it is sottish to say the same incapacity of reason and faith shall not excuse from the actual susception of baptism, which is less necessary, and to which faith and many other acts are necessary predispositions when it is reasonably and humanly[k]

[g] Lib. de Baptis. prope finem cap. 18. [p. 231 C.] Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est; præcipue tamen circa parvulos; . . fiant christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint.

[h] Orat. xl. quæst. in S. Baptisma. [cap. 28. tom. i. p. 718.]

[i] ['and S. Chrysostom . . man's age;' deest A.]

[j] [Mark xvi. 16.]

[k] [vid. p. 386, note h, supra.]

received. The conclusion is that baptism is also to be deferred till the time of faith; and whether infants have faith or no, is a question to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say nor how little they prove.

29. First, personal and actual faith they have none; for they have no acts of understanding; and besides, how can any man know that they have, since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any one that could tell?—Secondly, some say they have imputative faith; but then so let the sacrament be too: that is, if they have the parents' faith or the church's, then so let baptism be imputed also by derivation from them; that as in their mothers' womb and while they hang on their breasts they live upon their mothers' nourishment, so they may upon the baptism of their parents or their mother the church. For since faith is necessary to the susception of baptism (and themselves[k] confess it by striving to find out new kinds of faith to daub the matter up) such as the faith is, such must be the sacrament; for there is no proportion between an actual sacrament and an imputative faith, this being in immediate and necessary order to that. And whatsoever can be said to take off from the necessity of actual faith, all that and much more may be said to excuse from the actual susception of baptism.—Thirdly, the first of these devices was that of Luther and his scholars, the second of Calvin and his; and yet there is a third device which the church of Rome teaches, and that is, that infants have habitual faith. But who told them so? how can they prove it? what revelation or reason teaches any such thing? Are they by this habit so much as disposed to an actual belief without a new master? Can an infant sent into a Mahumetan province be more confident for christianity when he comes to be a man, than if he had not been baptized? are there any acts precedent, concomitant, or consequent, to this pretended habit? This strange invention is absolutely without art, without scripture, reason, or authority. But the men are to be excused, unless there were a better. But for all these stratagems[l], the argument now alleged against the baptism of infants is demonstrative and unanswerable.

30. To which also this consideration may be added, that if baptism be necessary to the salvation of infants, upon whom is the imposition laid? to whom is the command given? to the parents or to the children? Not to the children, for they are not capable of a law; not to the parents, for then God hath put the salvation of innocent babes into the power of others, and infants may be damned for their fathers' carelessness or malice. It follows that it is not necessary at all to be done to them, to whom it cannot be prescribed as a law, and in whose behalf it cannot be reasonably intrusted to others with the appendent necessity; and if it be not necessary, it is certain it is not reasonable, and most certain it is no where in terms prescribed:

[k] ['and they themselves' A, B.] [l] ['strategems' C.]

and therefore it is to be presumed that it ought to be understood and administered according as other precepts are, with reference to the capacity of the subject, and the reasonableness of the thing.

31. For I consider that the baptizing of infants does rush us upon such inconveniences, which in other questions we avoid like rocks: which will appear if we discourse thus;—

Either baptism produces spiritual effects, or it produces them not. If it produces not any, why is such contention about it? what are we the nearer heaven if we are baptized, and if it be neglected what are we the farther off? But if (as without all peradventure all the pædo-baptists will say) baptism does do a work upon the soul, producing spiritual benefits and advantages, these advantages are produced by the external work of the sacrament alone, or by that as it is helped by the co-operation and predispositions of the suscipient.

If by the external work of the sacrament alone, how does this differ from the *opus operatum* of the papists, save that it is worse? For they say the sacrament does not produce its effect but in a suscipient disposed by all requisites and due preparatives of piety, faith, and repentance; though in a subject so disposed they say the sacrament by its own virtue does it: but this opinion says, it does it of itself, without the help, or so much as the coexistence, of any condition but the mere reception.

But if the sacrament does not do its work alone, but *per modum recipientis*, according to the predispositions of the suscipient, then because infants can neither hinder it nor do any thing to further it, it does them no benefit at all. And if any man runs for succour to that exploded κρησφύγετον, that infants have faith, or any other inspired habit of I know not what or how, we desire no more advantage in the world, than that they are constrained to an answer without revelation, against reason, common sense, and all the experience in the world.

The sum of the argument in short is this, though under another representment.

Either baptism is a mere ceremony, or it implies a duty on our part. If it be a ceremony only, how does it sanctify us or 'make the comers thereunto perfect?' If it implies a duty on our part, how then can children receive it who cannot do duty at all?

And indeed this way of ministration makes baptism to be wholly an outward duty, a work of the law, a carnal ordinance; it makes us adhere to the letter without regard of the spirit, to be satisfied with shadows, to return to bondage, to relinquish the mysteriousness, the substance and spirituality of the gospel. Which argument is of so much the more consideration, because under the spiritual covenant or the gospel of grace, if the mystery goes not before the symbol (which it does when the symbols are seals and consignations of the grace, as it is said the sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it,

but never follows in order of time. And this is clear in the perpetual analogy of holy scripture.

For baptism is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoined, as a means of remission of sins or of eternal life, but something of duty, choice, and sanctity, is joined with it in order to production of the end so mentioned. "Know ye not that as many as are baptized into Christ Jesus are baptized into His death[l]?" There is the mystery and the symbol together, and declared to be perpetually united; ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν, 'all of us who were baptized' into one, were baptized into the other; not only into the name of Christ, but into His death also. But the meaning of this, as it is explained in the following words of S. Paul, makes much for our purpose: for to be baptized unto His death signifies "to be buried with Him in baptism, that as Christ rose from the dead, we also should walk in newness of life:" that's the full mystery of baptism. For being baptized into His death, or which is all one in the next words, ἐν ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, 'into the likeness of His death,' cannot go alone; 'if we be so planted into Christ, we shall be partakers of His resurrection:' and that is not here instanced in precise reward, but in exact duty; for all this is nothing but "crucifixion of the old man, a destroying the body of sin, that we no longer serve sin."

This indeed is truly to be baptized both in the symbol and the mystery; whatsoever is less than this is but the symbol only, a mere ceremony, an *opus operatum*, a dead letter, an empty shadow, an instrument without an agent to manage or force to actuate it.

Plainer yet: "Whosoever are baptized into Christ have put on Christ," "have put on the new man:" but to put on this new man, is "to be formed in righteousness, and holiness, and truth." This whole argument is the very words of S. Paul: the major proposition is dogmatically determined Gal. iii. 27, the minor in Ephes. iv. 24; the conclusion then is obvious, that they who are not 'formed new in righteousness, and holiness, and truth,' they who, remaining in the present incapacities, cannot 'walk in the newness[m] of life,' they have not been baptized into Christ: and then they have but one member of the distinction used by S. Peter[n], they have that baptism which is a 'putting away the filth of the flesh,' but they have not that baptism 'which is the answer of a good conscience towards God,' which is the only 'baptism that saves us:' and this is the case of children; and then the case is thus;—

As infants by the force of nature cannot put themselves into a supernatural condition (and therefore, say the pædo-baptists, they need baptism to put them into it) so if they be baptized before the use of reason, before the 'works of the Spirit,' before the operations of grace, before they can 'throw off the works of darkness,' and 'live in righteousness, and newness of life,' they are never the nearer. From the pains of hell they shall be saved by the mercies of God and

[l] [Rom. vi. 3—6.] [m] ['in newness' A.] [n] [1 Pet. iii. 21.]

their own innocence, though they die *in puris naturalibus;* and baptism will carry them no further. For that baptism that 'saves us' is not the only 'washing with water,' of which only children are capable, 'but the answer of a good conscience towards God,' of which they are not capable till the use of reason, till they know to choose the good and refuse the evil.

And from thence I consider anew, that all vows made by persons under others' names, stipulations made by minors, are not valid till they by a supervening act after they are of sufficient age do ratify them. Why then may not infants as well make the vow *de novo* as *de novo* ratify that which was made for them *ab antiquo*, when they come to years of choice? If the infant vow be invalid till the manly confirmation, why were it not as good they stayed to make it till that time, before which if they do make it, it is to no purpose[o]? This would be considered.

32. And in conclusion, our way is the surer way; for not to baptize children till they can give an account of their faith is the most proportionable to an act of reason and humanity, and it can have no danger in it. For to say that infants may be damned for want of baptism, a thing which is not in their power to acquire, they being persons not yet capable of a law, is to affirm that of God which we dare not say of any wise and good man. Certainly it is much derogatory to God's justice, and a plain defiance to the infinite reputation of His goodness.

33. And therefore whoever will pertinaciously persist in this opinion of the pædo-baptists, and practise it accordingly, they pollute the blood of the everlasting testament; they dishonour and make a pageantry of the sacrament; they ineffectually represent a sepulture into the death of Christ, and please themselves in a sign without effect, making baptism like the fig-tree in the gospel, full of leaves but no fruit; and they invocate the Holy Ghost in vain, doing as if one should call upon Him to illuminate a stone or a tree.

34. Thus far the anabaptists may argue; and men have disputed against them with so much weakness and confidence[p], that we may say of them, as S. Gregory Nazianzen observes of the case of the church in his time, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν δόγμασι τὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέρων σαθροῖς ταύτην θηρεύοντες, &c., 'they have been encouraged in their error more by the accidental advantages we have given them by our weak arguings, than by any excellency of their wit, and much less any advantage of their cause.'—It concerned not the present design of this book to enquire whether these men speak true or no: for if they speak probably, or so as may

[o] Vide Erasmum in præfat. ad annotat. [? 'paraphrasin'] in Matt. [tom. vii. init.]

[p] [The section from this point winds up in the first edition with one paragraph; the remainder as it stands was added in the second edition. See p. 561. note s, below.]

deceive them that are no fools, it is argument sufficient to persuade us to pity the erring man that is deceived without design: and that is all that I intended. But because all men will not understand my purpose or think my meaning innocent unless I answer the arguments which I have made or gathered for mine and their adversaries; although (I say) it be nothing to the purpose of my book, which was only to represent that even in a wrong cause there may be invincible causes of deception to innocent and unfortunate persons, and of this truth the anabaptists in their question of pædo-baptism is a very great instance; yet I will rather choose to offend the rules of art than not to fulfil all the requisites of charity: I have chosen therefore to add some animadversions upon the anabaptists' plea, upon all that is material, and which can have any considerable effect in the question. For though I have used this art and stratagem of peace justly, by representing the enemy's strength to bring the other party to thoughts of charity and kind comportments; yet I could not intend to discourage the right side, or to make either a mutiny or defection in the armies of Israel. I do not, as the spies from Canaan, say that these men are Anakims, and the city walls reach up to heaven, and there are giants in the land; I know they are not insuperable, but they are like the blind and the lame set before a wall, that a weak man can leap over, and a single troop armed with wisdom and truth can beat all their guards. But yet I think that he said well and wisely to Charles the fighting duke of Burgundy, that told him that the Switzers' strength was not so to be despised but that an honourable peace and a christian usage of them were better than a cruel and a bloody war. The event of that battle told all the world that no enemy is to be despised and rendered desperate at the same time; and that there are but few causes in the world but they do sometimes meet with witty advocates, and in themselves put on such semblances of truth as will (if not make the victory uncertain, yet) make peace more safe and prudent, and mutual charity to be the best defence.

And first, I do not pretend to say that every argument brought by good men and wise in a right cause must needs be demonstrative. The divinity of the eternal Son of God is a truth of as great concernment and as great certainty as any thing that ever was disputed in the christian church; and yet he that reads the writings of the fathers and the acts of councils convened about that great question, will find that all the armour is not proof which is used in a holy war. For that seems to one, which is not so to another; and when a man hath one sufficient reason to secure him and make him confident, every thing seems to him to speak the same sense, though to an adversary it does not: for the one observes the similitude, and pleaseth himself; the other watches only the dissonancies, and gets advantage; because one line of likeness will please a believing willing man, but one will not do the work; and where many dissimilitudes can be ob-

served and but one similitude, it were better to let the shadow alone than hazard the substance. And it is to be observed that heretics and misbelievers do apply themselves rather to disable truth than directly to establish their error; and every argument they wrest from the hand of their adversaries is to them a double purchase; it takes from the other and makes him less, and makes himself greater; the way to spoil a strong man is to take from him the armour in which he trusted: and when this adversary hath espied a weak part in any discourse, he presently concludes that the cause is no stronger, and reckons his victories by the colours that he takes, though they signified nothing to the strength of the cause. And this is the main way of proceeding in this question: for they rather endeavour to shew that we cannot demonstrate our part of the question, than that they can prove theirs. And as it is indeed easier to destroy than to build, so it is more agreeable to the nature and to the design of heresy: and therefore it were well that in this and in other questions where there are watchful adversaries, we should fight as Gideon did with three hundred hardy brave fellows that would stand against all violence, rather than to make a noise with rams' horns and broken pitchers[q], like the men at the siege of Jericho. And though it is not to be expected that all arguments should be demonstrative in a true cause, yet it were well if the generals of the church, which the scripture affirms is terrible as an army with banners[r], should not by sending out weak parties which are easily beaten weaken their own army, and give confidence to the enemy.

Secondly, although it is hard to prove a negative, and it is not in many cases to be imposed upon a litigant; yet when the affirmative is received and practised, whoever will disturb the actual persuasion must give his reason, and offer proof for his own doctrine, or let me alone with mine. For the reason why negatives are hard to prove is because they have no positive cause; but as they have no being, so they have no reason: but then also they are first, and before affirmatives, that is, such which are therefore to prevail because nothing can be said against them. Darkness is before light, and things are not before they are: and though to prove that things are, something must be said; yet to prove they are not, nothing is to be alleged but that they are not, and no man can prove they are. But when an affirmative hath entered and prevailed, because no effect can be without some positive cause, therefore this which came in upon some cause or other must not be sent away without cause: and because the negative is in this case later than the affirmative, it must enter as the affirmatives do, when they happen to be later than the negative. Add to this, that for the introduction of a negative against the possession of a prevailing affirmative, it is not enough to invalidate the arguments of the affirmative by making it appear they are not demonstrative; for although that might have been sufficient to hinder its

[q] [See Judg. vii.]

[r] [Cant. vi. 4.]

first entry, yet it is not enough to throw it out, because it hath gotten strength and reasonableness by long custom and dwelling upon the minds of men, and hath some forces beyond what it derives from the first causes of its introduction. And therefore whoever will persuade men to quit their long persuasions and their consonant practices, must not tell them that such persuasions are not certain, and that they cannot prove such practices to be necessary; but that the doctrine is false, against some other revealed truth which they admit, and the practice evil; not only useless, but dangerous or criminal. So that the anabaptists cannot acquit themselves and promote their cause by going about to invalidate our arguments, unless they do not only weaken our affirmative by taking away not one or two but all the confidences of its strength, but also make their own negative to include a duty, or its enemy to be guilty of a crime. And therefore if it were granted that we cannot prove the baptism of infants to be necessary, and that they could speak probably against all the arguments of the right believers; yet it were intolerable that they should be attended to unless they pretend, and make their pretence good, that they teach piety and duty and necessity; for nothing less than these can make recompense for so violent, so great an inroad and rape upon the persuasions of men. Whether the anabaptists do so or no will be considered in the sequel.

Thirdly, these arguments which are in this section urged in behalf of the anabaptists,—their persons I mean finally, not their cause at all but in order to their persons,—can do the less hurt because they rely upon our grounds, not upon theirs; that is, they are intended to persuade us to a charitable comport towards the men, but not at all to persuade their doctrine. For it is remarkable that none of them have made use of this way of arguing since the publication of these *Adversaria*[a]; and of some things they can never make use. As in that exposition of the words of S. Peter, "Be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost;" which is expounded to be meant not in baptism but in confirmation: which is a rite the anabaptists allow not, and therefore they cannot make use of any such exposition which supposes a divine institution of that which they at no hand admit. And so it is in divers other particulars; as any wary person, that is cautious he be not deluded by any weak and plausible pretence of theirs, may easily observe.

But after all, the arguments for the baptism of children are firm and valid, and though shaken by the adverse plea, yet as trees that stand in the face of storms take the surer root, so will the right reasons of the right believers, if they be represented with their proper advantages.

Ad 3. and 13.—The first argument is the circumcising of children, which we say does rightly infer the baptizing them: the anabaptist

[a] [See p. 558. note p, above.—First ed. 1647; second, 1657.]

says no; because admit that circumcision were the type of baptism, yet it follows not that the circumstances of one must infer the same circumstances in the other; which he proves by many instances: and so far he says true. And therefore if there were no more in the argument than can be inferred from the type to the antitype, both the supposition and the superstructure would be infirm; because it is uncertain whether circumcision be a type of baptism; and if it were granted, it cannot infer equal circumstances. But then this argument goes further, and to other and more material purposes, even to the overthrow of their chief pretension. For circumcision was 'a seal of the righteousness of faith[t]:' and if infants, who have no faith, yet can by a ceremony be admitted into the covenant of faith, as S. Paul contends that all the circumcised were, and it is certain of infants that they were reckoned amongst the Lord's people as soon as they were circumcised; then it follows that the great pretence of the anabaptists, that for want of faith infants are incapable of the sacrament, comes to nothing. For if infants were admitted into the covenant of faith by a ceremony before they could enter by choice and reason, by faith and obedience; then so they may now, their great and only pretence notwithstanding. Now whereas the anabaptist says that in the admission of the Jewish infants to circumcision and of christian infants to baptism there is this difference, that circumcision imprints a character on the flesh but baptism does not; circumcision had no word added but baptism hath; and therefore infants were capable of the former but not of the latter, for they might be cut with the circumcising-stone but they cannot be instructed with the word of baptism; in that there was a character left by which they might be instructed when they come to age, but in baptism there is no character, and the word they understand not; therefore that was to purpose, but this is not: I answer that this is something to the circumstance of the sacraments, but nothing to the substance of the argument. For if the covenant of faith can belong to infants, then it is certain they can have the benefit of faith before they have the grace; that is, God will do them benefit before they can do Him service: and that is no new thing in religion, that God should love us first. But then that God is not as much beforehand with christian as with Jewish infants, is a thing which can never be believed by them who understand that in the gospel God opened all His treasures of mercies, and unsealed the fountain itself, whereas before He poured forth only rivulets of mercy and comfort. That "circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith," S. Paul affirms; that so also is baptism (if it be any thing at all) the anabaptists must needs confess, because they refuse to give baptism to them who have not faith, and make it useless to them, as being a seal without a deed. But then the argument is good upon its first grounds. But then for the title Reparties[u] but now mentioned, that circumcision imprints

[t] [Rom. iv. 11.]

[u] [The editor has not been able to find what this word refers to.]

a character, but baptism does not; that baptism hath a word, but circumcision had none; they are just nothing to the purpose. For as that character imprinted on the infants' flesh would have been nothing of instruction to them unless there had been a word added, that is, unless they had been told the meaning of it when they came to be men; so neither will the word added to baptism be of use either to men or children, unless there be a character upon their spirits imprinted, when or before they come to the use of reason, by the holy Spirit of God: but therefore as the anabaptists would have our infants stay from the sacrament till they can understand the word, so also might the imprinting of a character on the flesh of the Jewish infants have been deferred till the word should be added, that is, till they could understand the word or declaration of the meaning of that character, without which they could not understand its meaning. The case is equal. In the Jewish infants the character was before the word, in the christian infants the word is before the character; but neither that nor this alone could do all the work of the sacrament; but yet it could do some, and when they could be conjoined, the office was completed. But therefore as the infants under Moses might have that which to them was an insignificant character; so may the infants under Christ have water, and a word whose meaning these shall understand as soon as those could understand the meaning of the character. So that these pretended differences signify nothing; and if they did, yet they are not certainly true, but rather certainly false; for although the scriptures mention not any form of words used in the Mosaic sacraments, yet the Jews' books record them. And then for the other, that there is no character imprinted in baptism it is impossible they should reasonably affirm, because it being spiritual is also undiscernible, and 'cometh not by observation.' And although there is no permanent or inherent quality imprinted by the Spirit in baptism that we know of, and therefore will not affirm (but neither can they know it is not, and therefore they ought not to deny, much less to establish any proposition upon it) yet it is certain that although no quality be imprinted before they come to the use of reason, yet a relation is contracted, and then the children have title to the promises, and are reckoned *in Christi censu*, 'in Christ's account,' they are members of His body: and though they can as yet do no duty, yet God can do them a favour; although they cannot yet perform a condition, yet God can make a promise; and though the anabaptists will be so bold as to restrain infants, yet they cannot restrain God, and therefore the sacrament is not to be denied to them. For although they can do nothing, yet they can receive something; they can by this sacrament as really be admitted into the covenant of faith, even before they have the grace of faith, as the infants of the Jews could: and if they be admitted to this covenant, they are children of faithful Abraham, and heirs of the promise.—All the other particulars of their answer to the argument

taken from circumcision are wholly impertinent: for they are intended to prove that circumcision, being a type of baptism, cannot prove that the same circumstances are to be observed: all which I grant. For circumcision was no type of baptism, but was a sacrament of initiation to the Mosaic covenant; and so is baptism, of initiation to the evangelical: circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith, and so is baptism; but they are both but rites and sacraments, and therefore cannot have the relation of type and antitype; they are both but external ministries fitted to the several periods of the law and the gospel, with this only difference, that circumcision gave place to, was supplied and succeeded to by, baptism. And as those persons who could not be circumcised, I mean the females, yet were baptized, as is notorious in the Jews' books and story, and by that rite were admitted to the same promises and covenant as if they had been circumcised; so much more when males and females are only baptized, baptism must be admitted and allowed to consign all that covenant of faith which circumcision did, and therefore to be dispensed to all them who can partake of that covenant, as infants did then, and therefore certainly may now. So that in short, we do not infer that infants are to receive this sacrament because they received that, but because the benefit and secret purpose of both is the same in some main regards; and if they were capable of the blessing then, so they are now; and if want of faith hindered not the Jewish babes from entering into the covenant of faith, then neither shall it hinder the christian babes: and if they can and do receive the benefit for which the ceremony was appointed as a sign and conduit, why they should not be admitted to the ceremony is so very a trifle, that it deserves not to become the entertainment of a fancy in the sober time of the day, but must go into the portion of dreams and illusions of the night.

Ad 4.—And as ill success will they have with the other answers. For although we intend the next argument but as a reasonable inducement of the baptizing infants by way of proportion to the other treatments they received from Christ; yet this probability, notwithstanding all that is said against it, may be a demonstration. For if infants can be brought to Christ by the charitable ministries of others when they cannot come themselves; if Christ did give them His blessing and great expressions of His love to them, when they could not by any act of their own dispose themselves to it; if the disciples, who then knew nothing of this secret, were reproved for hindering them to be brought, and upon the occasion of this a precept established for ever that children should be suffered to 'come to Him;' and though they were brought by others, yet it was all one as if they had 'come' themselves, and was so called, so expounded; and if the reason why they should be suffered to come is such a thing as must at least suppose them capable of the greatest blessing: there is no peradventure but this will amount to as much

as the grace of baptism will come to. For if we regard the outward ministry, that Christ did take them in His arms and lay His hands upon them is as much as if the apostles should take them in their arms and lay water upon them; if we regard the effect of it, that Christ blessed them is as much as if His ministers prayed over them; if we regard the capacity of infants, it is such that the kingdom of heaven belongs to them; that is, they also can be admitted to the covenant of the gospel, for that is the least signification of 'the kingdom of heaven;' or they shall be partakers of heaven, which is the greatest signification, and includes all the intermedial ways thither according to the capacity of the suscipients: if we regard the acceptance of the action and entertainment of the person, it is as great as Christ any where expresses: if we regard the precept, it cannot be supposed to expire in the persons of those little ones which were then brought, for they were come already; and though they were tacitly reprôved who offered to hinder them, yet the children were present; and therefore it must relate to others, to all infants, that they should for ever be brought to Christ. And this is also to be gathered from τοιούτων, 'of such,' not τούτων, 'of these;' for these are but a few, but 'the kingdom of God is of such' as these who are now brought; children make up a great portion of it, and the other portion is made up by such who become like to these. And if the transcript belong to the kingdom, it were strange if the exemplar should not; if none can enter but they who are like children, it must be certain that nothing can hinder the children. And lastly, if we regard the doctrine which Christ established upon this action, it will finish the argument into a certain conclusion; "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall not enter therein:" receive it as a little child receives it, that is, with innocence and without any let or hindrance. So that they who receive it best, receive it but as little children: for they, being the first in the kind, are made the measure of all the rest; and if others shall be excluded for not being like these, it is certain these are not to be excluded for not being like others: others are commanded to be like them in innocence, and that is sufficient to make them recipients of the divine grace; but therefore to make infants to be recipients, it is not required that they should have the use of reason. And we do not well consider that it is God who creates all our capacities of grace, and it is He who makes us able to receive what He intends to bestow, and nothing of ours can do it; no good actions can deserve any grace, much less the first grace, the grace of baptism; and all that men can do in the whole use of their reason and order of their life, is to return as much as they can to the innocence of their infancy; and prayer is but a seeking after pardon and grace whereby we may stand as innocents before God; and charity is but growing, and is here principally the extermination of all malice and envy; and by alms (as Daniel advised to Nebuchadnezzar) we

do but break off our sins; and our health is but the expulsion of evil humours; and our pleasure is but the removal of a pain; and

—— optimus . . est
Qui minimis urgetur;

and our best holiness is being like to infants: and therefore it is no wonder if God made them the principals in this line, and loves them so well who are innocent of any consent to evil. And although they have done no good, yet they are all that which God loves[x], they are His image undefiled, unscratched, unbroken by any act or consent of their own: but then it were a very great wonder if these, in whom God sees the work of His own hands, the image of His own essence, the purity of innocence, the capacities of glory, to whom His only Son gave such signal testimonies of His love, upon whom He bestowed a blessing, for whose sake He was much displeased when they were hindered to come, whom He declared the exemplar of those who should be saved, and the pattern and precedent of receiving His kingdom, to whom He imparted spiritual favours by a ceremony and a solemnity; I say it were a very great wonder that these should not receive the same favours in the way of ordinary establishment, who have the principal title, and did actually receive them in the extraordinary before the general appointment of the other. If there be any thing that can hinder them, it must be something without; for nothing within can hinder them to receive that which others cannot receive but by being like them; and if any thing without does hinder them, it cannot expect to fare better than the disciples, with whom Christ was much displeased. But of what can they now be hindered? Not of the grace of the sacrament; that is their own by way of eminent relation and propriety, "the kingdom of heaven is theirs," and of such as they are: not of the sacrament therefore or solemnity, for that is wholly for the other, and is nothing but an instrument, and hath a relative use and none else; and as it is to no purpose to any man till they receive the grace of it, so it can be for no reason detained from them who shall certainly have the grace, though they be forcibly deprived of the instrument. Unless therefore they who could come to Christ and were commanded to be brought to Christ when He was upon earth, may not, cannot come to Him now that He is in heaven and made our Advocate and our gracious Lord and King; unless they who had the honour of a solemnity from the hands of Christ may not be admitted to a ceremony from the hands of His servants; unless baptismal water be more than baptismal grace, and to be admitted into the church be more than to be admitted to heaven; it cannot with any plausible reason be pretended that infants are to be excluded from this sacrament.

Ad 14.—Now as for the little things which the anabaptist murmurs

[x] [The reader of these feeling paragraphs will remember the events which had recently occurred in Taylor's own family; see Life, letter of Feb. 22, 165$.]

against the first essay of this argument, they will quickly disappear. For whereas he says it were a better argument to say, that Christ blessed children, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not, therefore infants are not to be baptized; this is perfectly nothing, because Christ baptized none at all, men, women, nor children; and this will conclude against the baptism of men too as well as infants: and whereas it is hence inferred that because Christ baptized them not, therefore He hath other ways of bringing them to heaven than by baptism; it is very true, but makes very much against them. For if God hath other ways of bringing them to heaven who yet cannot believe, if they can go to heaven without faith, why not to the font? if they can obtain that glorious end in order to which the sacrament is appointed without the act of believing, then so also they may the means. But for what end, to what purpose, do they detain the water when they cannot keep back the Spirit? and why will they keep them from the church when they cannot keep them from God? and why do men require harder conditions of being baptized than of being saved? And then that God will by other means bring them to heaven if they have not baptism, is argument sufficient to prove that God's goodness prevails over the malice and ignorance of men, and that men contend more for shadows than for substances, and are more nice in their own ministrations than God is in the whole effusions of His bounty; and therefore that these disagreeing persons may do themselves injury, but in the event of things none to the children.

So that this argument, though slightly passed over by the anabaptist, yet is of very great persuasion in this article, and so used and relied upon by the church of England in her office of baptism; and for that reason I have the more insisted upon it.

Ad 5.—The next argument without any alteration or addition stands firm upon its own basis. Adam sinned, and left nakedness to descend upon his posterity, a relative guilt and a remaining misery; he left enough to kill us, but nothing to make us alive; he was the head of mankind in order to temporal felicity, but there was another head intended to be the representative of human nature to bring us to eternal; but the temporal we lost by Adam, and the eternal we could never receive from him but from Christ only; from Adam we receive our nature such as it is, but grace and truth comes by Jesus Christ; Adam left us an imperfect nature that tends to sin and death, but he left us nothing else, and therefore to holiness and life we must enter from another principle. So that besides the natural birth of infants, there must be something added by which they must be reckoned in a new account; they must be born again, they must be reckoned in Christ, they must be adopted to the inheritance, and admitted to the promise, and entitled to the Spirit. Now that this is done ordinarily in baptism is not to be denied: for therefore it is called λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, 'the font or laver of regeneration;' it

is the gate of the church, it is the solemnity of our admission to the covenant evangelical: and if infants cannot go to heaven by the first or natural birth, then they must go by a second and supernatural; and since there is no other solemnity or sacrament, no way of being born again that we know of but by the ways of God's appointing, and He hath appointed baptism, and all that are born again are born this way, even men of reason who have or can receive the Spirit being to enter at the door of baptism; it follows that infants also must enter here, or we cannot say that they are entered at all. And it is highly considerable that whereas the anabaptist does clamorously and loudly call for a precept for children's baptism; this consideration does his work for him and us. He that shews the way, needs not bid you walk in it: and if there be but one door that stands open, and all must enter some way or other, it were a strange perverseness of argument to say, that none shall pass in at that door unless they come alone; and they that are brought, or they that lean on crutches or the shoulders of others, shall be excluded and undone for their infelicity, and shall not receive help because they have the greatest need of it. But these men use infants worse than the poor paralytic was treated at the pool of Bethesda; he could not be washed because he had none to put him in, but these men will not suffer any one to put them in, and until they can go in themselves, they shall never have the benefit of the Spirit's moving upon the waters.

Ad 15.—But the anabaptist to this discourse gives only this reply, that the supposition or ground is true, a man by Adam or any way of nature cannot go to heaven, neither men nor infants without the addition of some instrument or means of God's appointing; but this is to be understood to be true only ordinarily and regularly, but the case of infants is extraordinary, for they are not within the rule and the way of ordinary dispensation; and therefore there being no command for them to be baptized, there will be some other way to supply it extraordinarily. To this I reply that this is a plain begging of the question, or a denying the conclusion; for the argument being this, that baptism being the ordinary way or instrument of new birth, and admission to the promises evangelical and supernatural happiness, and we knowing of no other, and it being as necessary for infants as for men to enter some way or other, it must needs follow that they must go this way, because there is a way for all, and we know of no other but this; therefore the presumption lies on this, that infants must enter this way: they answer that it is true in all but infants; the contradictory of which was the conclusion, and intended by the argument: for whereas they say God hath not appointed a rule and an order in this case of infants, it is the thing in question, and therefore is not by direct negation to be opposed against the contrary argument. For I argue thus, wherever there is no extraordinary way appointed, there we must all go the ordinary; but for infants there is no extraordinary way appointed or declared, there-

fore they must go the ordinary: and He that hath without difference commanded that all nations should be baptized, hath without difference commanded all sorts of persons; and they may as well say that they are sure God hath not commanded women to be baptized, or hermaphrodites, or eunuchs, or fools, or mutes, because they are not named in the precept; for sometimes in the census of a nation women are no more reckoned than children; and when the children of Israel coming out of Egypt were numbered, there was no reckoning either of women or children, and yet that was the number of the nation which is there described[y].

But then as to the thing itself, whether God hath commanded infants to be baptized, it is indeed a worthy enquiry, and the sum of all this contestation: but then it is also to be concluded by every argument that proves the thing to be holy, or charitable, or necessary, or the means of salvation, or to be instituted and made in order to an indispensable end. For all commandments are not expressed in imperial forms, as 'we will' or 'will not,' 'thou shalt' or 'shalt not;' but some are by declaration of necessity, some by a direct institution, some by involution and apparent consequence, some by proportion and analogy, by identities and parities, and Christ never expressly commanded that we should receive the holy communion, but that when the supper was celebrated it should be 'in His memorial[z].' And if we should use the same method of arguing in all other instances as the anabaptist does in this, and omit every thing for which there is not an express commandment with an open nomination and describing of the capacities of the persons concerned in the duty, we should have neither sacrament nor ordinance, fasting nor vows, communicating of women nor baptizing of the clergy. And when S. Ambrose was chosen bishop before he was baptized, it could never upon their account have been told that he was obliged to baptism; because though Christ commanded the apostles to baptize others, yet he no way told them that their successors should be baptized any more than the apostles themselves were, of whom we read nothing in scripture that either they were actually baptized or had a commandment so to be. To which may be added, that as the taking of priestly orders disobliges the suscipient from receiving chrism or confirmation in case he had it not before, so for aught appears in scripture to the contrary it may excuse from baptism. But if it does not, then the same way of arguing which obliges women or the clergy to be baptized, will be sufficient warrant to us to require in the case of infants no more signal precept than in the other, and to be content with the measures of wise men who give themselves to understand the meaning of doctrines and laws, and not to exact the tittles and unavoidable commands by which fools and unwilling persons are to be governed, lest they die certainly if they be not called upon with univocal, express, open and direct command-

[y] [Exod. xiii.]

[z] [1 Cor. xi. 24.]

ments. But besides all this and the effect of all the other arguments, there is as much command for infants to be baptized as for men; there being in the words of Christ no nomination or specification of persons, but only in such words as can as well involve children as old men; as *nisi quis*, and *omnes gentes*, and the like.

Ad 16.—But they have a device to save all harmless yet; for though it should be granted that infants are pressed with all the evils of original sin, yet there will be no necessity of baptism to infants, because it may very well be supposed that as infants contracted the relative guilt of Adam's sin, that is, the evils descending by an evil inheritance from him to us, without any solemnity; so may infants be acquitted by Christ without solemnity, or the act of any other man. This is the sum of the sixteenth number. To which the answer is easy. First, that at the most it is but a dream of proportions, and can infer only that if it were so, there were some correspondency between the effects descending upon us from the two great representatives of the world; but it can never infer that it ought to be so. For these things are not wrought by the ways of nature, in which the proportions are regular and constant; but they are wholly arbitrary and mysterious, depending upon extrinsic causes which are conducted by other measures, which we only know by events, and can never understand the reasons. For because the sin of Adam had effect upon us without a sacrament, must it therefore be wholly unnecessary that the death of Christ be applied to us by sacramental ministrations? If so, the argument will as well conclude against the baptism of men as of infants; for since they die in Adam, and had no solemnity to convey that death, therefore we by Christ shall all be made alive, and to convey this life there needs no sacrament. This way of arguing therefore is a very trifle; but yet this is not,—As infants were not infected with the stain and injured by the evils of Adam's sin but by the means of natural generation, so neither shall they partake of the benefits of Christ's death but by spiritual regeneration, that is, by being baptized into His death. For it is easier to destroy than to make alive; a single crime of one man was enough to ruin him and his posterity; but to restore us, it became necessary that the Son of God should be incarnate, and die, and be buried, and rise again, and intercede for us, and become our lawgiver, and we be His subjects and keep His commandments. There was no such order of things in our condemnation to death: must it therefore follow, that there is no such in the justification of us unto life? To the first there needs no sacrament, for evil comes fast enough; but to the latter there must go so much as God please; and the way which He hath appointed us externally is baptism: to which if He hath tied us, it is no matter to us whether He hath tied Himself to it or no: for although He can go which way He please, yet He himself loves to go in the ways of His ordinary appointing (as it appears in the extreme paucity of miracles which are in the world) and He will

not endure that we should leave them. So that although there are many thousand ways by which God can bring any reasonable soul to Himself, yet He will bring no soul to Himself by ways extraordinary when He hath appointed ordinary; and therefore although it be unreasonable, of our own heads to carry infants to God by baptism, without any direction from Him; yet it is not unreasonable to understand infants to be comprehended in the duty, and to be intended in the general precept, when the words do not exclude them, nor any thing in the nature of the sacrament; and when they have a great necessity, for the relief of which this way is commanded, and no other way signified, all the world will say there is reason we should bring them also the same way to Christ. And therefore though we no ways doubt but if we do not our duty to them, God will yet perform His merciful intention, yet that's nothing to us; though God can save by miracle, yet we must not neglect our charitable ministries; let Him do what He please to or for infants, we must not neglect them.

Ad 6.—The argument which is here described is a very reasonable inducement to the belief of the certain effect to be consequent to the baptism of infants; because infants can do nothing towards heaven, and yet they are designed thither, therefore God will supply it: but He supplies it not by any internal assistances, and yet will supply it, therefore by an external: but there is no other external but baptism, which is of His own institution, and designed to effect those blessings which infants need: therefore we have reason to believe that by this way God would have them brought.

Ad 17.—To this it is answered, after the old rate, that God will do it by His own immediate act. Well, I grant it; that is, He will give them salvation of His own goodness, without any condition on the infants' part personally performed: without faith and obedience, if the infant dies before the use of reason: but then whereas it is added that 'to say God will do it by an external act and ministry, and that by this rite of baptism and no other, is no good argument unless God could not do it without such means, or said He would not;' the reply is easy, that we say God will effect this grace upon infants by this external ministry, not because God cannot use another, nor yet because He hath said He will not, but because He hath given us this and hath given us no other. For he that hath a mind to make an experiment, may upon the same argument proceed thus. God hath given bread to strengthen man's heart, and hath said that in the sweat of our brows we shall eat bread: and it is commanded that if they do not work, they shall not eat: there being certain laws and conditions of eating, I will give to my labourers and hirelings, but therefore my child shall have none; for be you sure if I give to my child no man's-meat, yet God will take as great care of infants as of others, and God will by His own immediate mercy keep them alive as long as He hath intended them to live; but to say that therefore He will do it by external food, is no good argument, unless

God could not do it without such means, or that He had said He would not. To this I suppose any reasonable person would say I have given sufficient answer, if I tell him that the argument is good, that the infants must eat man's food, although God can keep them alive without it, and although He hath not said that He will not keep them alive without it; I say the argument is good, because He hath given them this way: and though He could give them another, and did never say He would not give them another; yet because He never did give them another, it is but reasonable that they should have this.—To the last clause of this number, viz., why cannot God as well do His mercies to infants now immediately as He did before the institution either of circumcision or baptism? I answer, that I know no man that says He cannot, but yet this was not sufficient to hinder babes from circumcision, and why then shall it hinder them from baptism? For though God could save infants always without circumcision as well as He did sometime, yet He required this of them; and therefore it may be so in baptism, this pretence notwithstanding.

Ad 7.—This number speaks to the main enquiry, and shews the commandment, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." This precept was in all ages expounded to signify the ordinary necessity of baptism to all persons; and *nisi quis* can mean infants as well as men of age: and because it commands a new birth and a regeneration, and implies that a natural birth cannot entitle us to heaven, but the second birth must; infants who have as much need and as much right to heaven as men of years, and yet cannot have it by natural or first birth, must have it by the second and spiritual: and therefore all are upon the same main account; and when they are accidentally differenced by age, they are also differenced by correspondent, accidental, and proportionable duties; but all must be born again. This birth is expressed here by water and the Spirit, that is, by the Spirit in baptismal water: for that is in scripture called 'the laver of a new birth or regeneration.'

Ad 18.—But here the anabaptist gives us his warrant. Though Christ said, None but those who are born again by water and the Spirit shall enter into heaven; he answers, fear it not, I will warrant you. To this purpose it was once said before, 'Yea but hath God said, In the day ye shall eat thereof ye shall die? I say ye shall not die, but ye shall be like gods.'—But let us hear the answer. First it is said that baptism and the Spirit signify the same thing, for by water is meant the effect of the Spirit. I reply that therefore they do not signify the same thing, because by water is meant the effect of the Spirit, unless the effect and the cause be the same thing; so that here is a contradiction in the parts of the allegation. But if they signify two things, as certainly they do, then they may as well signify the sign and the thing signified, as the cause

and the effect; or they may mean the sacrament and the grace of the sacrament, as it is most agreeable to the whole analogy of the gospel. For we are sure that Christ ordained baptism, and it is also certain that in baptism He did give the Spirit; and therefore to confound these two is to no purpose, when severally they have their certain meaning, and the laws of Christ and the sense of the whole church, the institution and the practice of baptism, make them two terms of a relation, a sign and a thing signified, the sacrament and the grace of the sacrament. For I offer it to the consideration of any man that believes Christ to have ordained the sacrament of baptism, which is most agreeable to the institution of Christ, that by 'water and the Spirit' should be meant the outward element and inward grace, or that 'by water and Spirit' should be meant only the Spirit cleansing us like water? But suppose it did mean so, what would be effected or persuaded by it more than by the other? If it be said that then infants by this place were not obliged to baptism, I reply that yet they were obliged to new birth nevertheless; they must be born again of the Spirit, if not of water and the Spirit: and if they are bound to be regenerate by the Spirit, why they shall not be baptized with water, which is the symbol and sacrament, the *vehiculum* and channel of its ordinary conveyance, I profess I cannot understand how to make a reasonable conjecture. But it may be they mean, that if by water and the Spirit be only meant *Spiritus purificans*, the 'cleansing, purifying Spirit,' then this place cannot concern infants at all: but this loop-hole I have already obstructed by placing a bar that can never be removed. For it is certain and evident, that regeneration or new birth is here enjoined to all as of absolute and indispensable necessity; and if infants be not obliged to it, then by their natural birth they go to heaven, or not at all: but if infants must be born again, then either let these adversaries shew any other way of new birth but this of water and the Spirit, or let them acknowledge this to belong to infants, and then the former discourse returns upon them in its full strength. So that now I shall not need to consider their parallel instance of "being baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire." For although there are differences enough to be observed, the one being only a prophecy, and the other a precept; the one concerning some only, and the other concerning all; the one being verified with degrees and variety, the other equally and to all: yet this place, which in the main expression I confess to have similitude, was verified in the letter and first signification of it, and so did relate to the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost[a] in the likeness of tongues of fire; but this concerns not all, for all were not so baptized. And whereas it is said in the objection that the Baptist told not Christ's disciples, but the Jews, and that therefore it was intended to relate to all: it was well observed, but to no purpose; for Christ at that time had no disciples. But he told it to the Jews: and yet it does not follow that they should all

[a] [Insert 'in Pentecost,' B.]

be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire; but it is meant only that that glorious effect should be to them a sign of Christ's eminency above him; they should see from Him a baptism greater than that of John. And that it must be meant of that miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit in Pentecost, and not of any secret gift or private immission, appears because the Baptist offered it as a sign and testimony of the prelation and greatness of Christ above him; which could not be proved to them by any secret operation which cometh not by observation, but by a great and miraculous mission, such as was that in Pentecost. So that hence to argue that we may as well conclude that infants must also pass through the fire as through the water, is a false conclusion inferred from no premises; because this being only a prophecy and inferring no duty, could neither concern men or children to any of the purposes of their argument. For Christ never said, 'Unless ye be baptized with fire and the Spirit, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,' but of 'water and the Spirit' He did say it: therefore though they must pass through the water, yet no smell of fire must pass upon them.

But there are yet two things by which they offer to escape. The one is that in these words baptism by water is not meant at all, but baptism by the Spirit only; because S. Peter having said that 'baptism saves us,' he adds by way of explication, "not the washing of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience towards God," plainly saying that it is 'not water but the Spirit.'—To this I reply, that when water is taken exclusively to the Spirit, it is very true that it is not water that cleanses the soul, and the cleansing of the body cannot save us; but whoever urges the necessity of baptism, urges it but as a necessary sacrament, or instrument to convey or consign the Spirit: and this they might with a little observation have learned; there being nothing more usual in discourse than to deny the effect to the instrument when it is compared with the principal, and yet not intend to deny to it an instrumental efficiency. It is not the pen that writes well, but the hand: and S. Paul[b] said, "It is not I but the grace of God;" and yet it was *gratia Dei mecum*, that is, the principal and the less principal together. So S. Peter, It is not water but the Spirit, or which may come to one and the same, not the washing the filth of the flesh but purifying the conscience, that saves us; and yet neither one nor the other are absolutely excluded, but the effect which is denied to the instrument is attributed to the principal cause. But however, this does no more concern infants than men of age; for they are not 'saved by the washing of the body, but by the answer of a good conscience,' by the Spirit of holiness and sanctification; that is, water alone does not do it unless the Spirit move upon the water. But that water also is in the ministry and is not to be excluded from its portion of the work, appears by the words of the apostle, "The like figure whereunto, even baptism,

[b] [1 Cor. xv. 10.]

saves us," &c., that is, baptism even as it is a figure, saves us, in some sense or other; by way of ministry and instrumental efficiency, by conjunction and consolidation with the other; but the ceremony, the figure, the rite, and external ministry, must be in, or else his words will in no sense be true, and could be made true by no interpretation; because the Spirit may be the thing figured, but can never be a figure.—The other little κρησφύγετον is that these words were spoken before baptism was ordained, and therefore could not concern baptism, much less prove the necessity of baptizing infants. I answer, that so are the sayings of the prophets long before the coming of Christ, and yet concerned His coming most certainly. Secondly, they were not spoken before the institution of baptism, for the disciples of Christ did baptize more than the Baptist even[c] in his lifetime; they were indeed spoken before the commission was of baptizing all nations, or taking the gentiles into the church, but not before Christ made disciples, and His apostles baptized them, among the Jews. And it was so known a thing that great prophets and the fathers of an institution did baptize disciples, that our blessed Saviour upbraided Nicodemus for his ignorance of that particular, and his not understanding words spoken in the proportion and imitation of a custom so known among them.

But then that this argument which presses so much may be attempted in all the parts of it, like soldiers fighting against cuirassiers that try all the joints of their armour, so do these to this. For they object (in the same number) that the exclusive negative of *nisi quis* does not include infants, but only persons capable; for (say they) this no more infers a necessity of infants' baptism, than the parallel words of Christ[d], *nisi comederitis*, 'unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,' infer a necessity to give them the holy communion, &c. With this argument men use to make a great noise in many questions, but in this it will signify but little. First, indeed to one of the Roman communion it will cause some disorder in this question, both because they think it unlawful to give the holy communion to infants, and yet that these words are meant of the holy communion; and if we thought so too, I do not doubt but we should communicate them with the same opinion of necessity as did the primitive church. But to the thing itself; I grant that the expression is equal, and infers an equal necessity in their respective cases; and therefore it is as necessary to eat the flesh of the Son of man and to drink His blood, as to be baptized: but then it is to be added, that eating and drinking are metaphors and allusions, used only upon occasion of Manna, which was then spoken of, and which occasioned the whole discourse; but the thing itself is nothing but that Christ should be received for the life of our souls as bread and drink is for the life of our bodies. Now because there are many ways of receiving Christ, there are so

[c] ['ever' C.] [d] [John vi. 53.]

many ways of obeying this precept; but that some way or other it be obeyed, is as necessary as that we be baptized. Here only it is declared to be necessary, that Christ be received, that we derive our life and our spiritual and eternal being from Him; now this can concern infants, and does infer an ordinary necessity of their baptism; for in baptism they are united to Christ, and Christ to them: in baptism they receive the beginnings of a new life from Christ: it is a receiving Christ which is the duty here enjoined; this is one way of doing it, and all the ways that they are capable of. And that this precept can be performed this way, S. Austin affirms expressly in his third book *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*[e]. In this thing there is nothing hard but the metaphors of eating and drinking. Now that this is to be spiritually understood, our blessed Lord himself affirms in answer to the prejudice of the offended Capernaites; that it is to be understood of faith, and that faith is the spiritual manducation, is the sense of the ancient church: and therefore in what sense soever any one is obliged to believe, in the same sense he is obliged to the duty of spiritual manducation, and no otherwise. But because infants[f] cannot be obliged to the act or habit of faith, and yet can receive the sacrament of faith, they receive Christ as they can, and as they can are entitled to life. But however, by this means the difficulty of the expression is taken off: for if by eating and drinking Christ is meant receiving Christ by faith, then this phrase can be no objection but that S. Austin's affirmative may be true, and that this commandment is performed by infants in baptism, which is the sacrament of faith. To eat and drink does with as great impropriety signify faith as baptism; but this is it which I said at first, that the metaphorical expression was no part of the precept, but the *vehiculum* of the commandment, occasioned by the preceding discourse of our blessed Saviour; and nothing is necessary but that Christ should be received by all that would have life eternal; of which because infants are capable, and without receiving Christ they (by virtue of these words) are not capable, and but in baptism they cannot receive Christ; it follows that these words are no argument to infer an equal necessity of communicating infants, but they are a good argument to prove a necessity of baptizing them.—Secondly, But further yet I demand, can infants receive Christ in the eucharist? Can they in that sacrament eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood? If they cannot, then neither these words nor any other can infer an equal necessity of being communicated, for they can infer none at all: and whether those other words of *nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.*, do infer a necessity of baptism, will be sufficiently cleared upon their own account. But if infants can receive Christ in the eucharist, to which they can no more dispose themselves by

[e] [cap. iv. sq. tom. x. col. 74 sqq.] Et in Serm. ad Infantes, apud V. Bedam in 1 Cor. x. [ver. 16.—tom. vi. col. 364.]

[f] See the disc. of the Real Presence, section 3.

repentance than they can to baptism by faith, then it were indeed very well if they were communicated, but yet not necessary; because if they can receive Christ in the eucharist, they can receive Christ in baptism; and if they can receive Him any way, this precept is performed by that way: and then whether they must also be communicated, must be enquired by other arguments; for whatsoever is in these words intended is performed by any way of receiving Christ, and therefore cannot infer more in all circumstances and to all persons.—Thirdly, suppose these words were to be expounded of sacramental manducation of the flesh of Christ in the Lord's supper, yet it does not follow that infants are as much bound to receive the communion as to receive the baptism. It is too crude a fancy to think that all universal propositions, whether affirmative or negative, equally expressed, do signify an equal universality. It is said in the law of Moses, "Whosoever is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people:" this indeed signifies universally, and included infants, binding them to that sacrament. But when it was said, "Whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be put to death, whether small or great[d];" although these words be expressed with as great a latitude as the other, yet it is certain it did not include infants, who could not seek the Lord. The same is the case of the two sacraments: the obligation to which we do not understand only by the preceptive words or form of the commandments, but by other appendages, and the words of duty that are relative to the suscipients of the several sacraments, and the analogy of the whole institution. Baptism is the sacrament of beginners, the eucharist of proficients; that is the birth, this is the nourishment of a Christian. There are many more things of difference to be observed. But as the church in several ages hath practised severally in this article, so in the particular there is no such certainty but that the church may without sin do it or not do it as she sees cause: but that there is not the same necessity in both to all persons, and that no necessity of communicating infants can be inferred from the parallel words, appears in the former answers; and therefore I stand to them.

Ad 9.—The sum of the sixth argument is this. The promise of the Holy Ghost is made to all, to us and to our children: and if the Holy Ghost belong to them, then baptism belongs to them also; because baptism is the means of conveying the Holy Ghost, as appears in the words of S. Peter, "Be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost[e];" as also because from this very argument S. Peter resolved to baptize Cornelius and his family, because they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost: for they that are capable of the same grace are receptive of the same sign. Now that infants also can receive the effects of the Holy Spirit is evident, because (besides that the promise of the Holy Ghost is made to all, to us and our

[d] [2 Chron. xv. 13.] [e] [Acts ii. 38 sq.]

posterity) S. Paul affirms that the children of believing parents are holy; but all holiness is an emanation from the Holy Spirit of God.

Ad 19.—To the words of S. Peter they answer, that the promise does appertain to our children, that is, to our posterity; but not till they are capable: they have the same right which we have, but enter not into possession of their right till they have the same capacity: for by 'children' are not meant infants, but as the 'children of Israel' signifies the descendants only, so it is here. And indeed this is true enough, but not pertinent enough to answer the intention and efficiency of these words. For I do not suppose that the word 'children' means infants, but 'you and your children' must mean all generations of christendom, all the descendants of christian parents: and if they belong to their posterity because they are theirs, then the promises belong to all that are so, and then children cannot be excluded. But I demand, have not the children of believing parents a title to the promises of the gospel? If they have none, then the kingdom of heaven belongs not to such, and if they die, we can do nothing but despair of their salvation; which is a proposition whose barbarity and unreasonable cruelty confutes itself. But if they have a title to the promises, then the thing is done, and this title of theirs can be signified by these words; and then either this is a good argument, or the thing is confessed without it. For he that hath a title to the promises of the gospel hath a title to this promise here mentioned, the promise of the Holy Spirit; for 'by Him we are sealed to the day of redemption.'

And indeed that this mystery may be rightly understood, we are to observe that the Spirit of God is the great ministry of the gospel, and whatsoever blessing evangelical we can receive, it is the emanation of the Spirit of God. Grace and pardon, wisdom and hope, offices and titles and relations, powers, privileges, and dignities, all are the good things of the Spirit; whatsoever we can profit withal, or whatsoever we can be profited by, is a gift of God the father of spirits, and is transmitted to us by the Holy Spirit of God. For it is but a trifle and a dream to think that no person receives the Spirit of God but he that can do actions and operations spiritual. S. Paul[f] distinguishes the effects of the Spirit into three classes, there are χαρίσματα and διακονίαι and ἐνεργήματα· besides these 'operations,' there are 'gifts' and 'ministries;' and they that receive not the ἐνεργήματα, the 'operations' or 'powers' to do actions spiritual, may yet receive 'gifts,' or at least the blessings of 'ministry;' they can be ministered to by others who from the Spirit have received the power of ministration. And I instance in these things in which it is certain we can receive the Holy Spirit without any predisposition of our own. First we can receive gifts; even the wicked have them, and they who shall be rejected at the day of judgment shall yet argue for themselves that they have wrought miracles in the name of

[f] [1 Cor. xii. 4—6.]

the Lord Jesus; and yet the gift of miracles is a gift of the Holy Spirit[g]: and if the wicked can receive them, who are of dispositions contrary to all the emanations of the Holy Spirit, then much more may children, who although they cannot prepare themselves any more than the wicked do, yet neither can they do against them to hinder or obstruct them. But of this we have an instance in a young child, Daniel, whose spirit God raised up to acquit the innocent[h], and to save her soul from unrighteous judges; and when the boys in the street sang Hosanna to the Son of David, our blessed Lord said that 'if they had held their peace, the stones of the street would have cried out Hosanna.' And therefore that God should 'from the mouths of babes and sucklings ordain His own praise,' is one of the *magnalia Dei*, but no strange thing to be believed by us, who are so apparently taught it in holy scripture.—Secondly, benediction or blessing is an emanation of God's holy spirit, and in the form of blessing which is recorded in the epistles of S. Paul, one great part of it is "the communication of the Holy Spirit." And it is very probable that those three are but *synonyma*; 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' is to give us His holy spirit, and 'the love of God' is to give us His holy spirit[i], for the Spirit is the love of the Father, and our blessed Saviour argues it as the testimony of God's love to us, "If ye who are evil know how to give good things to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give His spirit to them that ask Him?" Now since the great sum and compendium of evangelical blessings is the Holy Spirit, and this which is expressed by three synonymas in the second epistle to the Corinthians is in the first reduced to one, it is all but 'the grace of the Lord Jesus;' it will follow that since our blessed Saviour gave His solemn blessing to children, His blessing relating to the kingdom of heaven, "for of such is the kingdom," He will not deny His spirit to them; when He blessed them, He gave them something of His spirit, some emanation of that which blesses us all, and without which no man can be truly blessed.—Thirdly, titles to inheritance can be given to infants without any predisposing act of their own. Since therefore infants dying so can, as we all hope, receive the inheritance of saints, some mansion in heaven, in that kingdom which belongs to them and such as they are, and that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the consignation to that inheritance; nothing can hinder them from receiving the Spirit, that is, nothing can hinder them to receive a title to the inheritance of the saints, which is the free gift of God, and the effect and blessing from the Spirit of God.

Now how this should prove to infants to be a title to baptism is easy enough to be understood, "for by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body[k]," that is, the Spirit of God moves upon the waters of

[g] [1 Cor. xii. 9 sq.]
[h] [Susanna.]
[i] [1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 14.]
[k] [1 Cor. xii. 13.]

baptism, and in that sacrament adopts us into the mystical body of Christ, and gives us title to a co-inheritance with Him.

Ad 21.—So that this perfectly confutes what is said in the beginning of number 21, that baptism is not the means of conveying the Holy Ghost. For it is the Spirit that baptizes, it is the Spirit that adopts us to an inheritance of the promises; it is the Spirit that incorporates us into the mystical body of Christ: and upon their own grounds it ought to be confessed; for since they affirm the water to be nothing without the Spirit, it is certain that the water ought not to be without the Spirit, and therefore that this is the soul and life of the sacrament, and therefore usually in conjunction with that ministry unless we hinder it. And it cannot be denied but that the Holy Ghost was given ordinarily to new converts at their baptism: and whereas it is said in a parenthesis that this was not as the effect is to the cause or to the proper instrument, but as a consequent is to an antecedent in a chain of causes accidentally and by positive institution depending upon each other; it is a groundless assertion: for when the men were called upon to be baptized, and were told they should receive the Holy Ghost, and we find that when they were baptized they did receive the Holy Ghost; what can be more reasonable than to conclude baptism to be the ministry of the Spirit? And to say that this was not consequent properly and usually but accidentally only, it followed sometimes but was not so much as instrumentally effected by it, is as if one should boldly deny all effect to physic: for though men are called upon to take physic and told they should recover, and when they do take physic they do recover; yet men may unreasonably say this recovery does follow the taking of physic, not as an effect to the cause or to the proper instrument, but as a consequent is to an antecedent in a chain of causes accidentally and by positive institution depending upon each other. Who can help it if men will say that it happened that they recovered after the taking physic, but then was the time in which they should have been well however? The best confutation of them is to deny physic to them when they need, and try what nature will do for them without the help of art. The case is all one in this question, this only excepted, that in this case it is more unreasonable than in the matter of physic, because the Spirit is expressly signified to be the baptizer in the forecited place of S. Paul[1].

From hence we argue that since the Spirit is ministered in baptism, and that infants are capable of the Spirit, the Spirit of adoption, the Spirit of incorporation into the body of Christ, the Spirit sealing them to the day of redemption, the Spirit entitling them to the promises of the gospel, the Spirit consigning to them God's part of the covenant of grace; they are also capable of baptism: for whoever is capable of the grace of the sacrament is capable of the sign or sacrament itself.

To this last clause the anabaptist answers two things. First, that

[1] [1 Cor. xii. 13.]

the Spirit of God was conveyed sometimes without baptism. I grant it; but what then? therefore baptism is not the sign or ministry of the Holy Ghost? It follows not. For the Spirit is the great wealth and treasure of Christians, and is conveyed in every ministry of divine appointment; in baptism, in confirmation, in absolution, in orders, in prayer, in benediction, in assembling together.—Secondly, the other thing they answer is this, that it is not true that they who are capable of the same grace are capable of the same sign; for females were capable of the righteousness of faith, but not of the seal of circumcision. I reply, that the proposition is true not in natural capacities, but in spiritual and religious regards; that is, they who in religion are declared capable of the grace are by the same religion capable of the sacrament or sign of that grace. But naturally they may be incapable by accident, as in the objection is mentioned. But then this is so far from invalidating the argument, that it confirms it in the present instance. *Exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis.* For even the Jewish females although they could not be circumcised, yet they were baptized even in those days, as I have proved already[m]; and although their natural indisposition denied them to be circumcised, yet neither nature nor religion forbade them to be baptized; and therefore since the sacrament is such a ministry of which all are naturally capable, and none are forbidden by the religion, the argument is firm and unshaken, and concludes with as much evidence and certainty as the thing requires.

Ad 10.—The last argument from reason is, that it is reasonable to suppose that God in the period of grace, in the days of the gospel, would not give us a more contracted comfort and deal with us by a narrower hand, than with the Jewish babes, whom He sealed with a sacrament as well as enriched with a grace, and therefore openly consigned them to comfort and favour.

Ad 22.—To this they answer, that we are to trust the word without a sign, and since we contend that the promise belongs to us and to our children, why do we not believe this but require a sign? I reply, that if this concludes any thing, it concludes against the baptism of men and women; for they hear and read and can believe the promise, and it can have all its effects and produce all its intentions upon men; but yet they also require the sign, they must be baptized: and the reason why they require it is because Christ hath ordained it. And therefore although we can trust the promise without a sign, and that if we did not, this manner of sign would not make us believe it, for it is not a miracle, that is a sign proving, but it is a sacrament, that is 'a sign signifying;' and although we do trust the promise even in the behalf of infants when they cannot be baptized; yet by the same reason as we trust the promise, so we also use the rite, both in obedience to Christ; and we use the rite or the sacrament because we believe the promise; and if we did not believe

[m] See 'The great Exemplar,' part 1. disc. of Baptism, numb. 8—10.

that the promise did belong to our children, we would not baptize them. Therefore this is such an impertinent quarrel of the anabaptists, that it hath no strength at all but what it borrows from a cloud of words and the advantages of its representment. As God did openly consign His grace to the Jewish babes by a sacrament, so He does to ours; and we have reason to give God thanks not only for the comfort of it (for that's the least part of it) but for the ministry and conveyance of the real blessing in this holy mystery.

Ad 23, 24, 25.—That which remains of objections and answers is wholly upon the matter of examples and precedents from the apostles and first descending ages of the church; but to this I have already largely spoken in a discourse of this question[n], and if the anabaptists would be concluded by the practice of the universal church in this question, it would quickly be at an end. For although sometimes the baptism of children was deferred till the age of reason and choice, yet it was only when there was no danger of the death of the children; and although there might be some advantages gotten by such delation[o], yet it could not be endured that they should be sent out of the world without it; *κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα*, said S. Gregory Nazianzen[p], 'it is better they should be sanctified even when they understand it not than that they should go away from hence without the seal of perfection and sanctification.' Secondly; but that baptism was amongst the ancients sometimes deferred was not always upon a good reason, but sometimes upon the same account as men now-a-days defer repentance, or put off confession and absolution and the communion till the last day of their life; that their baptism might take away all the sins of their life. Thirdly, it is no strange thing that there are examples of late baptism, because heathenism and christianity were so mingled in towns and cities and private houses, that it was but reasonable sometimes to stay till men did choose their religion, from which it was so likely they might afterward be tempted. Fourthly, the baptism of infants was always most notorious and used in the churches of Africa, as is confessed by all that know the ecclesiastical story. Fifthly, among the Jews it was one and all; if the *major domo* believed, he believed for himself and all his family, and they all followed him to baptism even before they were instructed; and therefore it is that we find mention of the baptism of whole families, in which children are as well to be reckoned as the uninstructed servants; and if actual faith be not required before baptism, even of those who are naturally capable of it,—as it is notorious in the case of the jailer who believed, and at that very hour he and all his family were baptized,—then want of faith cannot prejudice infants, and then nothing can. Sixthly, there was never in the church a

[n] Disc. of Baptism of Infants, *versus finem*, in 'The great Exemplar,' part 1. p. 202. [vol. ii. p. 270 sqq.]

[o] [sic edd.]

[p] [Orat. xl. cap. 28. tom. i. p. 713.]

command against the baptizing infants; and whereas it is urged that in the council of Neocæsarea[q] the baptism of a pregnant woman did no way relate to the child, and that the reason there given excludes all infants upon the same account, because every one is to shew his faith by his own choice and election; I answer, that this might very well be in those times where christianity had not prevailed, but was forced to dispute for every single proselyte, and the mother was a Christian and the father a heathen; there was reason that the child should be let alone till he could choose for himself when peradventure it was not fit his father should choose for him; and that is the meaning of the words[q] of Balsamo and Zonaras upon that canon. But secondly, the words of the Neocæsarean canon are not rightly considered: for the reason is not relative to the child, but only to the woman, concerning whom the council thus decreed, "The woman with child may be baptized when she will, *οὐδὲν γὰρ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ διὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι*, for her baptism reaches not to the child, because every one confesses his faith by his own act and choice;" that is, the woman confesses only for herself, she intends it only for herself, she chooses only for herself; and therefore is only baptized for herself. But this intimates that if she could confess for her child, the baptism would relate to her child; but therefore when the parents do confess for the child, or the godfathers, and that the child is baptized into that confession, it is valid. However, nothing in this canon is against it.

I have now considered all that the anabaptists can with probability object against our arguments, and have discovered the weakness of their exceptions, by which although they are and others may be abused, yet it is their weakness that is the cause of it: for which although the men are to be pitied, yet it may appear now that their cause is not at all the better.

Ad 28.—It remains that I consider their own arguments by which they support themselves in their mispersuasion. First, 'it is against the analogy of the gospel; for besides that Christ never baptized any infants, nor His apostles, there is required to baptism faith and repentance; of which because infants are not capable, neither are they capable of the sacrament.'—To these things I answer, that it is true Christ never baptized infants, for He baptized no person at all; but He blessed infants, and what that amounts to I have already discoursed; and He gave a commandment of baptism which did include them also, as I have proved in the foregoing periods and in other places. That the apostles never baptized infants, is boldly said, but can never be proved. But then as to the main of the argument, that faith and repentance are prerequired, I answer, 1) It is in this as it was in circumcision, to which a proselyte could not be admitted from gentilism or idolatry unless he gave up his name

[q] [vid. p. 552 sq. supra.]

to the religion, and believed in God and His servant Moses; but yet their children might; and it might have been as well argued against their children as ours, since in their proselytes and ours there were required predispositions of faith and repentance. 2) But it is no wonder that these are called for by the apostles of those whom they invited to the religion; they dealt with men of reason, but such who had superinduced foul sins to their infidelity, which were to be removed before they could be illuminated and baptized; but infants are in their pure naturals, and therefore nothing hinders them from receiving the gifts and mere graces of God's holy spirit before mentioned. 3) But we see also that although Christ required faith of them who came to be healed, yet when any were brought, or came in behalf of others, He only required faith of them who came, and their faith did benefit to others. For no man can call on him on whom they have not believed, but therefore they who call must believe; and if they call for others, they must believe that Christ can do it for others[r]. But this instance is so certain a reproof of this objection of theirs, which is their principal, which is their all, that it is a wonder to me they should not all be convinced at the reading and observing of it. I knew an eminent person amongst them who having been abused by their fallacies, upon the discovery of the falsehood of this their main allegation was converted: and I know also some others who could not at all object against it, but if they had been as humble as they were apprehensive, would certainly have confessed their error. But to this I can add nothing new beyond what I have largely discoursed of in the treatise of baptism before mentioned.

Ad 30.—The next argument is, If baptism be necessary to infants, upon whom is the imposition laid? to whom is the command given? The children are not capable of a law, therefore it is not given to them: nor yet to the parents, because if so, then the salvation of infants should be put into the power of others, who may be careless or malicious.—I answer, that there is no precept of baptizing infants just in that circumstance of age, for then they had sinned who had deferred it upon just grounds to their manhood. But it is a precept given to all, and it is made necessary by that order of things which Christ hath constituted in the New testament; so that if they be baptized at all in their just period, there is no commandment broken; but if infants come not to be men, then it was accidentally necessary they should have been baptized before they were men. And now to the enquiry upon whom the imposition lies, it is easy to give an answer: it lies upon them who can receive it, and therefore upon the parents: not so that the salvation of infants depends upon others, God forbid; but so that if they neglect the charitable ministry, they shall dearly account for it. It is easy to be understood by two instances. God commanded that children should be circumcised;

[r] Matt. ix. 28; Mark ix. 23; Matt. viii. 13; John iv. 50.

Moses by his wife's peevishness neglected it, and therefore the Lord sought to kill him for it, not Gershom the child. It is necessary for the preservation of children's lives that they eat, but the provisions of meat for them is a duty incumbent on the parents; and yet if parents expose their children, it may be the lives of the children shall not depend on others, but "when their father and mother forsaketh them the Lord taketh them up:" and so it is in this particular, what is wanting to them by the neglect of others God will supply by His own graces and immediate dispensation. But if baptism be made necessary to all, then it ought to be procured for those who cannot procure it for themselves; just as meat and drink, and physic, and education. And it is in this as it is in blessing; little babes cannot ask it, but their needs require it; and therefore as by their friends they were brought to Christ to have it, so they must without their asking minister it to them who yet are bound to seek it as soon as they can. The precept binds them both in their several periods.

Ad 31.—But their next great strength consists in this dilemma, 'If baptism does no good, there needs no contention about it: if it does, then either by the *opus operatum* of the sacrament, or by the dispositions of the suscipient; if the former, that's worse than popery; if the latter, then infants cannot receive it, because they cannot dispose themselves to its reception.' I answer, that it works its effect neither by the ceremony alone, nor yet by that and the dispositions together, but by the grace of God working as He please, seconding His own ordinance; and yet infants are rightly disposed for the receiving the blessings and effects of baptism. For the understanding of which we are to observe, that God's graces are so free that they are given to us upon the accounts of His own goodness only, and for the reception of them we are tied to no other predispositions but that we do not hinder them. For what worthiness can there be in any man to receive the first grace? Before grace there can be nothing good in us, and therefore before the first grace there is nothing that can deserve it, because before the first grace there is no grace, and consequently no worthiness. But the dispositions which are required in men of reason, is nothing but to remove the hindrances of God's grace, to take off the contrarieties to the good Spirit of God. Now because in infants there is nothing that can resist God's spirit, nothing that can hinder Him, nothing that can grieve Him, they have that simplicity and nakedness, that passivity and negative disposition, or non-hindrances, to which all that men can do in disposing themselves are but approaches and similitudes; and therefore infants can receive all that they need, all that can do them benefit. And although there are some effects of the Holy Spirit which require natural capacities to be their foundation, yet those are the ἐνεργήματα or powers of working; but the χαρίσματα, and the inheritance and the title to the promises, require nothing on our part but that we can

receive them, that we put no hindrance to them; for that is the direct meaning of our blessed Saviour, "He that doth not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein;" that is, without that nakedness and freedom from obstruction and impediment, none shall enter.

Upon the account of this truth, all that long harangue that pursues this dilemma in other words to the same purposes, will quickly come to nothing. For baptism is not a mere ceremony, but, assisted by the grace of the Lord Jesus, the communication of the Holy Spirit; and yet it requires a duty on our part when we are capable of duty, and need it: but is enabled to produce its effect without any positive disposition, even by the negative of children, by their not putting a bar to the Holy Spirit of God, that God may be glorified, and may be all in all.

Two particulars more are considerable in their argument.

The first is a syllogism made up out of the words of S. Paul[s], "All that are baptized into Christ have put on Christ:" the minor proposition is, with a little straining some other words of S. Paul, thus, 'but they that put on Christ' or 'the new man' must be 'formed in righteousness and holiness of truth;' for so the apostle[t], "Put ye on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness:" but infants cannot put on Christ to any such purposes, and therefore cannot be baptized into Christ.—I answer, that to put on Christ is to become like unto Him, and we put Him on in all ways by which we resemble Him. The little babes of Bethlehem were like unto Christ when it was given to them to die for Him who died for them and us; we are like unto Him when we have put on His robe of righteousness, when we are invested with the wedding-garment, when we submit to His will and to His doctrine, when we are adopted to His inheritance, when we are innocent, and when we are washed, and when we are buried with Him in baptism. The expression is a metaphor, and cannot be confined to one particular signification: but if it could, yet the apostle does not say that all who in any sense put on the new man are actually holy and righteous; neither does he say that by the 'new man' is meant Christ, for that also is another metaphor, and it means a new manner of living. When Christ is opposed to Adam, Christ is called the 'new man;' but when the new man is opposed to the old conversation, then by the 'new man' Christ is not meant; and so it is in this place, it signifies to become a new man, and it is an exhortation to those who had lived wickedly now to live holily and according to the intentions of christianity. But to take two metaphors from two several books, and to concentre them into one signification, and to make them up into one syllogism, is *fallacia quatuor terminorum;* they prove nothing but the craft of the men or the weakness of the cause. For the

[s] [Gal. iii. 27.] [t] [Eph. iv. 24.]

words to the Ephesians were spoken to them who already had been baptized, who had before that in some sense put on Christ, but yet he calls upon them to put on the new man; therefore this is something else; and it means that they should verify what they had undertaken in baptism; which also can concern children, but is seasonable to urge it to them as S. Paul does to the Ephesians, after their baptism.—But yet after all, let the argument press as far as it is intended, yet infants even in the sense of the apostle do 'put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness:' for so are they; they are 'a new creation,' they are 'born again,' they are efformed after the image of Christ by the designation and adoption of the Holy Spirit; but as they cannot do acts of reason, and yet are created in a reasonable nature; so they are anew created in righteousness, even before they can do acts spiritual; that is, they are *designati sanctitatis*, as Tertullian's[u] expression is; they are in the second birth as in the first, instructed with the beginnings and principles of life, not with inherent qualities, but with titles and relations to promises and estates[v] of blessing and assistances of holiness; which principles of life, if they be nourished, will express themselves in perfect and symbolical actions. The thing is easy to be understood by them who observe the manner of speaking usual in scripture: 'we are begotten to a lively hope,' so S. Paul; the very consignation and designing us to that hope which is laid up for the saints is a new birth, a regeneration, the beginnings of a new life, and of this infants are as capable as any.

The other thing is this, that the infants' vow is invalid till it be after confirmed in the days of reason, and therefore it were as good to be let alone till it can be made with effect. I answer, that if there were nothing in the sacrament but the making of a vow, I confess I could see no necessity in it, nor any convenience, but that it engages children to an early piety, and their parents and guardians by their care to prevent the follies of their youth; but then when we consider that infants receive great blessings from God in this holy ministry, that what is done to them on God's part is of great effect before the ratification of their vow, this prudential consideration of theirs is light and airy.

And after all this it will be easy to determine which is the surer way. For certainly to baptize infants is hugely agreeable to that charity which Christ loved in those who brought them to Him; and if infants die before the use of reason, it can do them no hurt that they were given to God in a holy designation; it cannot any way be supposed, and is not pretended by any one, to prejudice their eternity; but if they die without baptism, it is then highly questioned whether they have not an intolerable loss. And if it be questioned by wise men whether the want of it do not occasion their eternal loss, and it is not questioned whether baptism does them any

[u] [vid. p. 548, not. r, supra.]

[v] ['states' B.]

hurt or no, then certainly to baptize them is the surer way without all peradventure.

Ad 33.—The last number sums up many words of affrightment together, but no argument, nothing but bold and unjustifiable assertions; against which I only oppose their direct contradictories. But instead of them the effect of the former discourse is this, that whoever shall pertinaciously deny or carelessly neglect the baptism of infants, does uncharitably expose his babes to the danger of an eternal loss, from which there is no way to recover but an extraordinary way, which God hath not revealed to us; he shuts them out of the church, and keeps them out who are more fit to enter than himself; he as much as lies in him robs the children of the gifts of the Holy Ghost and a title to the promises evangelical; he supposes that they cannot receive God's gifts unless they do in some sense or other deserve them, and that a negative disposition is not sufficient preparation to a new creation, and an obediential capacity is nothing, and yet it was all that we could have in our first creation; he supposes that we must do something before the first grace, that is, that God does not love us first, but we first love Him; that we seek Him, and He does not seek us; that we are beforehand with Him, and therefore can do something without Him; that nature can alone bring us to God. For if he did not suppose all this, his great pretence of the necessity of faith and repentance would come to nothing; for infants might without such dispositions receive the grace of baptism, which is always the first, unless by the superinducing of actual sins upon our nature we make it necessary to do something to remove the hindrances of God's spirit, and that some grace be accidentally necessary before that which ordinarily and regularly is the first grace. He I say that denies baptism to infants does disobey Christ's commandment, which being in general and indefinite terms must include all that can be saved or can come to Christ, and he excepts from Christ's commandment whom he please[x] without any exception made by Christ; he makes himself lord of the sacrament, and takes what portions he please[x] from his fellow-servants, like an evil and an unjust steward; he denies to bring little children to Christ, although our dearest Lord commanded them to be brought; he upbraids the practice and charity of the holy catholic church, and keeps infants from the communion of saints, from a participation of the promises, from their part of the covenant, from the laver of regeneration, from being rescued from the portion of Adam's inheritance, from a new creation, from the kingdom of God, which belongs to them and such as are like them. And he that is guilty of so many evils and sees such horrid effects springing from his doctrine, must quit his error, or else openly profess love to a serpent, and direct enmity to the most innocent part of mankind.

I do not think the anabaptists perceive or think these things to follow from their doctrine, but yet they do so really: and therefore

[x] ['pleases' C.]

the effect of this is that their doctrine is wholly to be reproved and disavowed, but the men are to be treated with the usages of a Christian; strike them not as an enemy, but exhort them as brethren. They are with all means christian and humane[y] to be redargued or instructed: but if they cannot be persuaded, they must be left to God, who knows every degree of every man's understanding, all his weaknesses and strengths, what impress every argument makes upon his spirit, and how uncharitable every reason is, and He alone judges of his ignorance or his malice, his innocency or his avoidable deception. We have great reason to be confident as to our own part of the question; but it were also well if our knowledge would make us thankful to God, and humble in ourselves, and charitable to our brother. It is pride that makes contention, but humility is the way of peace and truth.

§ 19. That there may be no toleration of doctrines inconsistent with piety, or the public good.

1. But then for their other capital opinion with all its branches, that it is not lawful for princes to put malefactors to death, nor to take up defensive arms, nor to minister an oath, nor to contend in judgment, it is not to be disputed with such liberty as the former. For although it be part of that doctrine which Clemens Alexandrinus[z] says was delivered *per secretam traditionem apostolorum, non licere christianis contendere in judicio, nec coram gentibus nec coram sanctis; et perfectum non debere jurare;* and the other part seems to be warranted by the eleventh canon of the Nicene council, which enjoins penance to them that take arms after their conversion to christianity: yet either these authorities are to be slighted, or be made receptive of any interpretation, rather than the commonwealth be disarmed of its necessary supports, and all laws made ineffectual and impertinent. For the interest of the republic and the well-being of bodies politic is not to depend upon the nicety of our imaginations, or the fancies of any peevish or mistaken priests; and there is no reason a prince should ask John-a-Brunck whether his understanding would give him leave to reign and be a king. Nay, suppose there were divers places of scripture which did seemingly restrain the political use of the sword, yet since the avoiding a personal inconvenience hath by all men been accounted sufficient reason to expound scripture to any sense rather than the literal, which infers an unreasonable inconvenience, (and therefore the 'pulling out an eye' and the 'cutting off a hand' is expounded by mortifying a vice and killing a criminal habit,) much rather must the allegations against the power of the sword endure any sense rather than it should be thought that christianity should destroy that which is the only instrument of justice, the restraint of vice and support of bodies politic. It is certain that Christ and His apostles and christian

[y] [vid. p. 386, not. h, supra.]
[z] Lib. vii. Strom. [capp. 14 et 8. pp. 883 sq. et 861.]

religion did comply with the most absolute government and the most imperial that was then in the world, and it could not have been at all endured in the world if it had not; for indeed the world itself could not last in regular and orderly communities of men, but be a perpetual confusion, if princes and the supreme power in bodies politic were not armed with a coercive power to punish malefactors: the public necessity and universal experience of all the world convinces those men of being most unreasonable that make such pretences which destroy all laws, and all communities, and the bands of civil societies, and leave it arbitrary to every vain or vicious person whether men shall be safe, or laws be established, or a murderer hanged, or princes rule. So that in this case men are not so much to dispute with particular arguments, as to consider the interest and concernment of kingdoms and public societies. For the religion of Jesus Christ is the best establisher of the felicity of private persons and of public communities: it is a religion that is prudent and innocent, humane and reasonable, and brought infinite advantages to mankind, but no inconvenience, nothing that is unnatural, or unsociable, or unjust. And if it be certain that this world cannot be governed without laws, and laws without a compulsory signify nothing; then it is certain that it is no good religion that teaches doctrine whose consequents will destroy all government; and therefore it is as much to be rooted out as any thing that is the greatest pest and nuisance to the public interest. And that we may guess at the purposes of the men and the inconvenience of such doctrine, these men that did first intend by their doctrine to disarm all princes and bodies politic, did themselves take up arms to establish their wild and impious fancy. And indeed that prince or commonwealth that should be persuaded by them, would be exposed to all the insolencies of foreigners, and all mutinies of the teachers themselves, and the governors of the people could not do that duty they owe to their people, of protecting them from the rapine and malice which will be in the world as long as the world is. And therefore here they are to be restrained from preaching such doctrine, if they mean to preserve their government, and the necessity of the thing will justify the lawfulness of the thing. If they think it to themselves, that cannot be helped, so long it is innocent as much as concerns the public: but if they preach it, they may be accounted authors of all the consequent inconveniences, and punished accordingly. No doctrine that destroys government is to be endured. For although those doctrines are not always good that serve the private ends of princes, or the secret designs of state, which by reason of some accidents or imperfections of men may be promoted by that which is false and pretending; yet no doctrine can be good that does not comply with the formality of government itself, and the well-being of bodies politic. *Augur cum esset Cato*[a], *dicere ausus est optimis auspiciis ea geri quæ*

[a] [log. 'Fabius.']

pro reipublicæ salute gererentur, quæ contra rempublicam ferrentur contra auspicia ferri[b]. Religion is to meliorate the condition of a people, not to do it disadvantage, and therefore those doctrines that inconvenience the public are no parts of good religion. *Ut respub. salva sit,* is a necessary consideration in the permission of prophesyings; for according to the true, solid, and prudent ends of the republic, so is the doctrine to be permitted or restrained, and the men that preach it according as they are good subjects and right commonwealth's men. For religion is a thing superinduced to temporal government, and the church is an addition of a capacity to a commonwealth, and therefore is in no sense to disserve the necessity and just interests of that to which it is superadded for its advantage and conservation.

2. And thus by a proportion to the rules of these instances all their other doctrines are to have their judgment as concerning toleration or restraint; for all are either speculative or practical, they are consistent with the public ends or inconsistent, they teach impiety or they are innocent; and they are to be permitted or rejected accordingly. For in the question of toleration, the foundation of faith, good life and government is to be secured; in all other cases the former considerations are effectual.

§ 20. How far the religion of the church of Rome is tolerable.

1. But now concerning the religion of the church of Rome (which was the other instance I promised to consider) we will proceed another way, and not consider the truth or falsity of the doctrines, for that is not the best way to determine this question concerning permitting their religion or assemblies. Because that a thing is not true, is not argument sufficient to conclude that he that believes it true is not to be endured; but we are to consider what inducements they are that possess the understanding of those men, whether they be reasonable and innocent, sufficient to abuse or persuade wise and good men; or whether the doctrines be commenced upon design, and managed with impiety, and then have effects not to be endured.

2. And here first I consider, that those doctrines that have had long continuance and possession in the church cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it from so many ages; and it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the several ends of divers ages. But however, long prescription is a prejudice oftentimes so insupportable that it cannot with many arguments be retrenched, as relying upon these grounds,—That truth is more ancient than falsehood; that God would not for so many ages forsake His church and leave her in an error; that what-

[b] Cicero de Senectute. [cap. iv. tom. iii. p. 298.]

soever is new is not only suspicious but false: which are suppositions pious and plausible enough. And if the church of Rome had communicated infants so long as she hath prayed to saints or baptized infants, the communicating would have been believed with as much confidence as the other articles are, and the dissentients with as much impatience rejected. But this consideration is to be enlarged upon all those particulars which, as they are apt to abuse the persons of the men and amuse their understandings, so they are instruments of their excuse, and by making their errors to be invincible, and their opinions though false yet not criminal, make it also to be an effect of reason and charity to permit the men a liberty of their conscience, and let them answer to God for themselves and their own opinions. Such as are the beauty and splendour of their church; their pompous service; the stateliness and solennity of the hierarchy; their name of 'catholic,' which they suppose their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christians; the antiquity of many of their doctrines; the continual succession of their bishops; their immediate derivation from the apostles; their title to succeed S. Peter; the supposal and pretence of his personal prerogatives; the advantages which the conjunction of the imperial seat with their episcopal hath brought to that see; the flattering expressions of minor bishops, which by being old records have obtained credibility; the multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion; apparent consent with antiquity in many ceremonials which other churches have rejected; and a pretended and sometimes an apparent consent with some elder ages in many matters doctrinal; the advantage which is derived to them by entertaining some personal opinions of the fathers which they with infinite clamours see to be cried up to be a doctrine of the church of that time; the great consent of one part with another, in that which most of them affirm to be *de fide;* the great differences which are commenced amongst their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying unto a very great licentiousness; their happiness of being instruments in converting divers nations; the advantages of monarchical government, the benefit of which as well as the inconveniences (which though they feel they consider not) they daily do enjoy; the piety and the austerity of their religious orders of men and women; the single life of their priests and bishops; the riches of their church; the severity of their fasts and their exterior observances; the great reputation of their first bishops for faith and sanctity; the known holiness of some of those persons whose institutes the religious persons pretend to imitate; their miracles false or true, substantial or imaginary; the casualties and accidents that have happened to their adversaries, which being chances of humanity, are attributed to several causes according as the fancies of men and their interests are pleased or satisfied; the temporal felicity of their professors; the oblique arts and indirect proceedings of some of those who departed from them; and amongst many other things, the

names of heretic and schismatic which they with infinite pertinacy fasten upon all that disagree from them. These things, and divers others, may very easily persuade persons of much reason, and more piety, to retain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seisure[c] of men's understandings before the opposite professions had a name: and so much the rather because religion hath more advantages upon the fancy and affections than it hath upon philosophy and severe discourses, and therefore is the more easily persuaded upon such grounds as these, which are more apt to amuse than to satisfy the understanding.

3. Secondly, if we consider the doctrines themselves, we shall find them to be superstructures ill built and worse managed; but yet they keep the foundation; they build upon God in Jesus Christ, they profess the apostles' creed, they retain faith and repentance as the supporters of all our hopes of heaven, and believe many more truths than can be proved to be of simple and original necessity to salvation. And therefore all the wisest personages of the adverse party allowed to them possibility of salvation, whilst their errors are not faults of their will, but weaknesses and deceptions of the understanding. So that there is nothing in the foundation of faith that can reasonably hinder them to be permitted; the foundation of faith stands secure enough for all their vain and unhandsome superstructures.

But then on the other side, if we take account of their doctrines as they relate to good life, or are consistent or inconsistent with civil government, we shall have other considerations.

4. Thirdly; for I consider that many of their doctrines do accidentally teach or lead to ill life; and it will appear to any man that considers the result of these propositions. Attrition (which is a low and imperfect degree of sorrow for sin, or as others say, a sorrow for sin, commenced upon any reason of a religious hope, or fear, or desire, or any thing else) is a sufficient disposition for a man in the sacrament of penance to receive absolution, and be justified before God, by taking away the guilt of all his sins and the obligation to eternal pains. So that already the fear of hell is quite removed upon conditions so easy, that many men take more pains to get a groat than by this doctrine we are obliged to for the curing and acquitting all the greatest sins of a whole life of the most vicious person in the world. And but that they affright their people with a fear of purgatory, or with the severity of penances in case they will not venture for purgatory (for by their doctrine they may choose or refuse either) there would be nothing in their doctrine or discipline to impede and slacken their proclivity to sin. But then they have as easy a cure for that too, with a little more charge sometimes, but most commonly

[c] ['seizure' B.]

with less trouble; for there are so many confraternities, so many privileged churches, altars, monasteries, cemeteries, offices, festivals, and so free a concession of indulgences appendent to all these, and a thousand fine devices to take away the fear of purgatory, to commute or expiate penances, that in no sect of men do they with more ease and cheapness reconcile a wicked life with the hopes of heaven, than in the Roman communion.

5. And indeed if men would consider things upon their true grounds, the church of Rome should be more reproved upon doctrines that infer ill life than upon such as are contrariant to faith. For false superstructures do not always destroy faith; but many of the doctrines they teach, if they were prosecuted to the utmost issue, would destroy good life. And therefore my quarrel with the church of Rome is greater and stronger upon such points which are not usually considered, than it is upon the ordinary disputes which have to no very great purpose so much disturbed christendom; and I am more scandalized at her for teaching the sufficiency of attrition in the sacrament, for indulging penances so frequently, for remitting all discipline, for making so great a part of religion to consist in externals and ceremonials, for putting more force and energy, and exacting with more severity, the commandments of men than the precepts of justice and internal religion; lastly, besides many other things, for promising heaven to persons after a wicked life, upon their impertinent cries and ceremonials transacted by the priests and the dying person. I confess I wish the zeal of christendom were a little more active against these and the like doctrines, and that men would write and live more earnestly against them than as yet they have done.

6. But then what influence this just zeal is to have upon the persons of the professors, is another consideration. For as the pharisees did preach well and lived ill, and therefore were to be heard, not imitated; so if these men live well, though they teach ill, they are to be imitated, not heard; their doctrines by all means christian and humane are to be discountenanced, but their persons tolerated *ealenus*; their profession and decrees to be rejected and condemned, but the persons to be permitted, because by their good lives they confute their doctrines, that is, they give evidence that they think no evil to be consequent to such opinions; and if they did, that they live good lives is argument sufficient that they would themselves cast the first stone against their own opinions, if they thought them guilty of such misdemeanours.

7. Fourthly, But if we consider their doctrines in relation to government and public societies of men, then if they prove faulty, they are so much the more intolerable by how much the consequents are of greater danger and malice; such doctrines as these,—The pope may dispense with all oaths taken to God or man; he may absolve subjects from their allegiance to their natural prince; faith is not to be kept

with heretics; heretical princes may be slain by their subjects.—These propositions are so depressed, and do so immediately communicate with matter and the interests of men, that they are of the same consideration with matters of fact, and are to be handled accordingly. To other doctrines ill life may be consequent, but the connexion of the antecedent and the consequent is not peradventure perceived or acknowledged by him that believes the opinion with no greater confidence than he disavows the effect and issue of it: but in these the ill effect is the direct profession and purpose of the opinion; and therefore the man, and the man's opinion, is to be dealt withal just as the matter of fact is to be judged; for it is an immediate, a perceived, a direct event, and the very purpose of the opinion. Now these opinions are a direct overthrow to all human society and mutual commerce, a destruction of government, and of the laws, and duty and subordination which we owe to princes: and therefore those men of the church of Rome that do hold them and preach them, cannot pretend to the excuses of innocent opinions and hearty persuasions, to the weakness of humanity and the difficulty of things; for God hath not left those truths which are necessary for conservation of the public societies of men so intricate and obscure, but that every one that is honest and desirous to understand his duty will certainly know, that no christian truth destroys a man's being sociable, and a member of the body politic, co-operating to the conservation of the whole as well as of itself. However if it might happen that men should sincerely err in such plain matters of fact (for there are fools enough in the world) yet if he hold his peace, no man is to persecute or punish him; for then it is mere opinion, which comes not under political cognizance, that is, that cognizance which only can punish corporally: but if he preaches it, he is actually a traitor, or seditious, or author of perjury, or a destroyer of human society, respectively to the nature of the doctrine; and the preaching such doctrines cannot claim the privilege and immunity of a mere opinion, because it is as much matter of fact as any the actions of his disciples and confidents, and therefore in such cases is not to be permitted, but judged according to the nature of the effect it hath or may have upon the actions of men.

8. Fifthly; but lastly, in matters merely speculative the case is wholly altered, because the body politic, which only may lawfully use the sword, is not a competent judge of such matters which have not direct influence upon the body politic, or upon the lives and manners of men as they are parts of a community; not but that princes or judges temporal may have as much ability as others, but by reason of the incompetency of the authority. And Gallio[d] spoke wisely when he discoursed thus to the Jews, "If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should hear you: but if it be a question of words and names and of your law, look ye

[d] Acts xviii. 14.

to it, for I will be no judge of such matters." The man spoke excellent reason, for the cognizance of these things did appertain to men of the other robe. But the ecclesiastical power, which only is competent to take notice of such questions, is not of capacity to use the temporal sword or corporal inflictions. The mere doctrines and opinions of men are things spiritual, and therefore not cognoscible by a temporal authority; and the ecclesiastical authority which is to take cognizance is itself so spiritual, that it cannot inflict any punishment corporal.

9. And it is not enough to say that when the magistrate restrains the preaching such opinions, if any man preaches them he may be punished, and then it is not for his opinion but his disobedience that he is punished: for the temporal power ought not to restrain prophesyings where the public peace and interest is not certainly concerned; and therefore it is not sufficient to excuse him whose law in that case, being by an incompetent power, made a scruple where there was no sin.

10. And under this consideration come very many articles of the church of Rome which are wholly speculative, which do not derive upon practice, which begin in the understanding and rest there, and have no influence upon life and government but very accidentally, and by a great many removes; and therefore are to be considered only so far as to guide men in their persuasions, but have no effect upon the persons of men, their bodies or their temporal condition. I instance in two, Prayer for the dead, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation; these two to be instead of all the rest.

11. For the first, this discourse is to suppose it false, and we are to direct our proceedings accordingly, and therefore I shall not need to urge with how many fair words and gay pretences this doctrine is set off, apt either to cozen or instruct the conscience of the wisest, according as it is true or false respectively. But 'we find,' says the Romanist, 'in the history of the Maccabees that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead; which also appears by other testimonies, and by their form of prayers still extant which they used in the captivity. It is very considerable that since our blessed Saviour did reprove all the evil doctrines and traditions of the scribes and pharisees, and did argue concerning the dead and the resurrection against the Sadducees, yet He spake no word against this public practice, but left it as He found it; which He who came to declare to us all the will of His Father would not have done if it had not been innocent, pious, and full of charity. To which by way of consociation if we add that S. Paul[e] did pray for Onesiphorus, that "the Lord would shew him a mercy in that day," that is, according to the style of the New testament, the day of judgment; the result will be, that although it be probable that Onesiphorus at that time was dead (because in his salutations he salutes his household, without naming

[e] 2 Tim. i. 18.

him who was the *major domo*, against his custom of salutations in other places) yet besides this, the prayer was for such a blessing to him whose demonstration and reception could not be but after death; which implies clearly that then there is a need of mercy, and by consequence the dead people, even to the day of judgment inclusively, are the subject of a misery[f], the object of God's mercy, and therefore fit to be commemorated in the duties of our piety and charity, and that we are to recommend their condition to God, not only to give them more glory in the reunion, but to pity them to such purposes in which they need; which because they are not revealed to us in particular, it hinders us not in recommending the persons in particular to God's mercy, but should rather excite our charity and devotion. For it being certain that they have a need of mercy, and it being uncertain how great their need is, it may concern the prudence of charity to be the more earnest, as not knowing the greatness of their necessity.

12. And if there should be any uncertainty in these arguments, yet its having been the universal practice of the church of God in all places, and in all ages till within these hundred years, is a very great inducement for any member of the church to believe that in the first traditions of christianity and the institutions apostolical, there was nothing delivered against this practice, but very much to insinuate or enjoin it; because the practice of it was at the first, and was universal. And if any man shall doubt of this, he shews nothing but that he is ignorant of the records of the church: it being plain in Tertullian[g] and S. Cyprian[h], who were the eldest writers of the Latin church, that in their times it was *ab antiquo* the custom of the church to pray for the souls of the faithful departed in the dreadful mysteries. And it was an institution apostolical (says one of them) and so transmitted to the following ages of the church; and when once it began upon slight grounds and discontent to be contested against by Aërius, the man was presently condemned for a heretic, as appears in Epiphanius.'

13. But I am not to consider the arguments for the doctrine itself, although the probability and fair pretence of them may help to excuse such persons who upon these or the like grounds do heartily believe it; but I am to consider that whether it be true or false, there is no manner of malice in it, and at the worst it is but a wrong error upon the right side of charity, and concluded against by its adversaries upon the confidence of such arguments which possibly are not so probable as the grounds pretended for it.

14. And if the same judgment might be made of any more of

[f] [? i. e. of a miseration or *miserere*.

"No more ay-mees and miseries, Tranio,
Come near my brain."

Beaum. and Fletcher.—Tamer tamed, act iii. sc. 1.]

[g] De corona milit. c. 3. [vid. p. 102 A.] et De monogam. c. 10. [p. 531 A.]

[h] Ep. lxvi. [al. i. p. 3.]

their doctrines, I think it were better men were not furious in the condemning such questions, which either they understood not upon the grounds of their proper arguments, or at least consider not as subjected in the persons, and lessened by circumstances, by the innocency of the event, or other prudential considerations.

15. But the other article is harder to be judged of, and hath made greater stirs in christendom, and hath been dashed at with more impetuous objections, and such as do more trouble the question of toleration. For if the doctrine of Transubstantiation be false (as upon much evidence we believe it is) then it is accused of introducing idolatry, giving divine worship to a creature, adoring of bread and wine; and then comes in the precept of God to the Jews[i] that those prophets who persuaded to idolatry should be slain.

16. But here we must deliberate, for it is concerning the lives of men; and yet a little deliberation may suffice. For idolatry is a forsaking the true God, and giving divine worship to a creature or to an idol, that is, to an imaginary God who hath no foundation in essence or existence; and is that kind of superstition which by divines is called the superstition of an undue object. Now it is evident that the object of their adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts, and purposes, and by which God principally if not solely takes estimate of human actions) in the blessed sacrament, is the only true and eternal God hypostatically joined with His holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the sacramental signs; and if they thought Him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread in this case that themselves profess it to be idolatry to do so, which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idolatrical. If their confidence and fanciful opinion hath engaged them upon so great mistake (as without doubt it hath) yet the will hath nothing in it but what is a great enemy to idolatry, *Et nihil ardet in inferno nisi propria voluntas*[k]. And although they have done violence to all philosophy and the reason of man, and undone and cancelled the principles of two or three sciences, to bring in this article; yet they have a divine revelation whose literal and grammatical sense, if that sense were intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the sciences in the circle. And indeed that transubstantiation is openly and violently against natural reason is no argument to make them disbelieve it who believe the mystery of the Trinity in all those niceties of explication which are in the school (and which now-a-days pass for the doctrine of the church) with as much violence to the principles of natural and supernatural philosophy as can be imagined to be in the point of transubstantiation.

17. But for the article itself; we all say that Christ is there pre-

[i] [Deut. xiii.]

[k] [vid. S. Bernard. de resurrect. Dom., serm. iii. col. 173.—Taylor, 'Duct. dubit.' bk. ii. chap. 3. rule 5.]

sent some way or other extraordinary, and it will not be amiss to worship Him at that time when He gives Himself to us in so mysterious a manner and with so great advantages, especially since the whole office is a consociation of divers actions of religion and worship. Now in all opinions of those men who think it an act of religion to communicate and to offer, a divine worship is given to Christ, and is transmitted to Him by mediation of that action and that sacrament; and it is no more in the church of Rome, but that they differ and mistake infinitely in the manner of His presence; which error is wholly seated in the understanding, and does not communicate with the will. For all agree that the divinity and the humanity of the Son of God is the ultimate and adequate object of divine adoration, and that it is incommunicable to any creature whatsoever; and before they venture to pass an act of adoration, they believe the bread to be annihilated, or turned into His substance who may lawfully be worshipped; and they who have these thoughts are as much enemies of idolatry as they that understand better how to avoid that inconvenience which is supposed to be the crime which they formally hate and we materially avoid. This consideration was concerning the doctrine itself.

18. Secondly, and now for any danger to men's persons for suffering such a doctrine, this I shall say, that if they who do it are not formally guilty of idolatry, there is no danger that they whom they persuade to it should be guilty. And what persons soever believe it to be idolatry to worship the sacrament, while that persuasion remains will never be brought to it, there is no fear of that; and he that persuades them to do it by altering their persuasions and beliefs, does no hurt but altering the opinions of the men and abusing their understandings: but when they believe it to be no idolatry, then their so believing it is sufficient security from that crime, which hath so great a tincture and residency in the will that from thence only it hath its being criminal.

19. Thirdly; however, if it were idolatry, I think the precept of God to the Jews of killing false and idolatrous prophets will be no warrant for Christians so to do. For in the case of the apostles and the men of Samaria, when James and John would have called for fire to destroy them even as Elias did under Moses' law, Christ distinguished the spirit of Elias from His own spirit, and taught them a lesson of greater sweetness, and consigned this truth to all ages of the church, that such severity is not consistent with the meekness which Christ by His example and sermons hath made a precept evangelical; at most it was but a judicial law, and no more of argument to make it necessary to us than the Mosaical precepts of putting adulterers to death, and trying the accused persons by the waters of jealousy.

20. And thus in these two instances I have given account what is to be done in toleration of diversity of opinions. The result of which

is principally this,—Let the prince and the secular power have a care the commonwealth be safe: for whether such or such a sect of Christians be to be permitted is a question rather political than religious; for as for the concernments of religion, these instances have furnished us with sufficient to determine us in our duties as to that particular, and by one of these all particulars may be judged.

21. And now it were a strange inhumanity to permit Jews in a commonwealth whose interest is served by their inhabitation, and yet upon equal grounds of state and policy not to permit differing sects of Christians. For although possibly there is more danger men's persuasions should be altered in a commixture of divers sects of Christians, yet there is not so much danger when they are changed from Christian to Christian, as if they be turned from Christian to Jew, or Moor, as many are daily in Spain and Portugal.

22. And this is not to be excused by saying the church hath no power over them *qui foris sunt*, as Jews are. For it is true the church in the capacity of spiritual regiments hath nothing to do with them, because they are not her diocese, yet the prince hath to do with them when they are subjects of his regiment. They may not be excommunicate any more than a stone may be killed, because they are not of the Christian communion; but they are living persons, parts of the commonwealth, infinitely deceived in their religion, and very dangerous if they offer to persuade men to their opinions, and are the greatest enemies of Christ, whose honour and the interest of whose service a christian prince is bound with all his power to maintain. And when the question is of punishing disagreeing persons with death, the church hath equally nothing to do with them both, for she hath nothing to do with the temporal sword; but the prince whose subjects equally Christians and Jews are, hath equal power over their persons; for a Christian is no more a subject than a Jew is, the prince hath upon them both the same power of life and death: so that the Jew by being no Christian is not *foris*, or any more an exempt person for his body or his life than the Christian is; and yet in all churches where the secular power hath temporal reason to tolerate the Jews, they are tolerated without any scruple in religion. Which thing is of more consideration because the Jews are direct blasphemers of the Son of God, and blasphemy by their own law, the law of Moses, is made capital; and might with greater reason be inflicted upon them who acknowledge its obligation, than urged upon Christians as an authority enabling princes to put them to death, who are accused of accidental and consecutive blasphemy and idolatry respectively, which yet they hate and disavow with much zeal and heartiness of persuasion. And I cannot yet learn a reason why we shall not be more complying with them who are of the household of faith: for at least they are children, though they be but rebellious children, (and if they were not, what hath the mother to do with them any more than with the Jews?) they are in some relation

or habitude of the family; for they are consigned with the same baptism, profess the same faith delivered by the apostles, are erected in the same hope, and look for the same glory to be revealed to them at the coming of their common Lord and Saviour, to whose service according to their understanding they have vowed themselves. And if the disagreeing persons be to be esteemed as heathens and publicans, yet not worse. "Have no company with them," that is the worst that is to be done to such a man in S. Paul's[l] judgment, "yet count him not as an enemy but admonish him as a brother."

§ 21. Of the duty of particular churches in allowing communion.

1. FROM these premises we are easily instructed concerning the lawfulness or duty respectively of christian communion, which is differently to be considered in respect of particular churches to each other, and of particular men to particular churches. For as for particular churches, they are bound to allow communion to all those that profess the same faith upon which the apostles did give communion. For whatsoever preserves us as members of the church gives us title to the communion of saints; and whatsoever faith or belief that is to which God hath promised heaven, that faith makes us members of the catholic church. Since therefore the judicial acts of the church are then most prudent and religious when they nearest imitate the example and piety of God; to make the way to heaven straighter than God made it, or to deny to communicate with those with whom God will vouchsafe to be united, and to refuse our charity to those who have the same faith, because they have not all our opinions and believe not every thing necessary which we overvalue, is impious and schismatical; it infers tyranny on one part, and persuades and tempts to uncharitableness and animosities on both; it dissolves societies, and is an enemy to peace; it busies men in impertinent wranglings; and by names of men and titles of factions it consigns the interessed parties to act their differences to the height, and makes them neglect those advantages which piety and a good life bring to the reputation of christian religion and societies.

2. And therefore Vincentius Lirinensis[m], and indeed the whole church, accounted the Donatists heretics upon this very ground, because they did imperiously deny their communion to all that were not of their persuasion; whereas the authors of that opinion for which they first did separate and make a sect, because they did not break the church's peace nor magisterially prescribe to others, were in that disagreeing and error accounted catholics. *Divisio enim et disunio facit vos hæreticos, pax et unitas faciunt catholicos*, said S. Austin[n]. And to this sense is that of S. Paul[o], "If I had all faith,

[l] [2 Thess. iii. 14 sq.]

[m] Cap. xi. [al. vi. p. 105.]—Vid. Pacian. epist. ad Sempron. 2. [in Bibl. vett. patr. Galland., tom. vii. p. 260.]

[n] Contr. lit. Petil., lib. ii. c. 95. [tom. ix. col. 284.]

[o] [1 Cor. xiii. 2.]

and had not charity, I am nothing." He who upon confidence of his true belief denies a charitable communion to his brother, loses the reward of both. And if pope Victor had been as charitable to the Asiatics as pope Anicetus and S. Polycarp were to each other in the same disagreeing concerning Easter, Victor had not been πληκτικώτερον κατατιθέμενος, so bitterly reproved and condemned as he was for the uncharitable managing of his disagreeing by Polycrates and Irenæus[p]. *Concordia enim quæ est caritatis effectus est unio voluntatum non opinionum,* 'true faith which leads to charity, leads on to that which unites wills and affections, not opinions[q].'

3. Upon these or the like considerations the emperor Zeno[r] published his ἑνωτικὸν, in which he made the Nicene creed to be the medium of catholic communion; and although he lived after the council of Chalcedon, yet he made not the decrees of that council an instrument of its restraint and limit, as preferring the peace of christendom and the union of charity far before a forced or pretended unity of persuasion, which never was nor ever will be real and substantial; and although it were very convenient if it could be had, yet it is therefore not necessary because it is impossible. And if men please, whatever advantages to the public would be consequent to it may be supplied by a charitable compliance and mutual permission of opinion, and the offices of a brotherly affection prescribed us by the laws of christianity. And we have seen it that all sects of Christians, when they have an end to be served upon a third, have permitted that liberty to a second which we now contend for, and which they formerly denied, but now grant, that by joining hands they might be the stronger to destroy the third. The Arians and Meletians joined against the catholics; the catholics and Novatians joined against the Arians. Now if men would do that for charity which they do for interest, it were handsomer and more ingenuous; for that they do permit each other's disagreeings for their interest's sake, convinceth them of the lawfulness of the thing, or else the unlawfulness of their own proceedings. And therefore it were better they would serve the ends of charity than of faction; for then that good end would hallow the proceeding, and make it both more prudent and more pious, while it serves the design of religious purposes.

§ 22. That particular men may communicate with churches of different persuasions: and how far they may do it.

1. As for the duty of particular men in the question of communicating with churches of different persuasions, it is to be regulated according to the laws of those churches. For if they require no impiety or any thing unlawful as the condition of their communion, then they communicate with them as they are servants of Christ, as disciples of His doctrine and subjects to His laws, and the particular distinguishing doctrine of their sect

[p] Euseb., l. v. [c. 24.]
[q] Aquin. 2. 2ᵉ. q. xxxvii. [art. 1.]
[r] [Evagr. Hist. eccl., iii. 14. p. 345.]

hath no influence or communication with him who from another sect is willing to communicate with all the servants of their common Lord. For since no church of one name is infallible, a wise man may have either the misfortune or a reason to believe of every one in particular that she errs in some article or other; either he cannot communicate with any, or else he may communicate with all that do not make a sin, or the profession of an error, to be the condition of their communion. And therefore as every particular church is bound to tolerate disagreeing persons in the senses and for the reasons above explicated, so every particular person is bound to tolerate her, that is, not to refuse her communion when he may have it upon innocent conditions. For what is it to me if the Greek church denies[s] procession of the third Person from the second, so she will give me the right hand of fellowship though I affirm it, therefore because I profess the religion of Jesus Christ, and retain all matters of faith and necessity? But this thing will scarce be reduced to practice; for few churches that have framed bodies of confession and articles will endure any person that is not of the same confession; which is a plain demonstration that such bodies of confession and articles do much hurt, by becoming instruments of separating and dividing communions, and making unnecessary or uncertain propositions a certain means of schism and disunion. But then men would do well to consider whether or no such proceedings do not derive the guilt of schism upon them who least think it; and whether of the two is the schismatic, he that makes unnecessary and (supposing the state of things) inconvenient impositions, or he that disobeys them because he cannot without doing violence to his conscience believe them; he that parts communion because without sin he could not entertain it, or they that have made it necessary for him to separate by requiring such conditions which to no man are simply necessary, and to his particular are either sinful or impossible.

2. The sum of all is this; there is no security in any thing or to any person but in the pious and hearty endeavours of a good life, and neither sin nor error does impede it from producing its proportionate and intended effect; because it is a direct deletery to sin, and an excuse to errors by making them innocent and therefore harmless. And indeed this is the intendment and design of faith. For (that we may join both ends of this discourse together) therefore certain articles are prescribed to us and propounded to our understanding, so that we might be supplied with instructions, with motives and engagements to incline and determine our wills to the obedience of Christ. So that obedience is just so consequent to faith, as the acts of will are to the dictates of the understanding. Faith therefore being in order to obedience, and so far excellent as itself is a part of obedience, or the promoter of it, or an engagement to it; it is evident that if obedience and a good life be secured

[s] [But see p. 356, note q, above.]

upon the most reasonable and proper grounds of christianity, that is, upon the APOSTLES' CREED, then faith also is secured. Since whatsoever is beside the duties, the order of a good life, cannot be a part of faith, because upon faith a good life is built: all other articles, by not being necessary, are no otherwise to be required but as they are to be obtained and found out, that is, morally, and fallibly, and humanly. It is fit all truths be promoted fairly and properly, and yet but few articles prescribed magisterially, nor framed into symbols and bodies of confession; least of all after such composures should men proceed so furiously as to say all disagreeing after such declarations to be damnable for the future and capital for the present. But this very thing is reason enough to make men more limited in their prescriptions, because it is more charitable in such suppositions so to do.

3. But in the thing itself, because few kinds of errors are damnable, it is reasonable as few should be capital. And because every thing that is damnable in itself and before God's judgment-seat is not discernible before men (and questions disputable are of this condition) it is also very reasonable that fewer be capital than what are damnable, and that such questions should be permitted to men to believe, because they must be left to God to judge. It concerns all persons to see that they do their best to find out truth; and if they do, it is certain that let the error be never so damnable, they shall escape the error or the misery of being damned for it. And if God will not be angry at men for being invincibly deceived, why should men be angry one at another? For he that is most displeased at another man's error may also be tempted in his own will, and as much deceived in his understanding; for if he may fail in what he can choose, he may also fail in what he cannot choose; his understanding is no more secured than his will, nor his faith more than his obedience. It is his own fault if he offends God in either; but whatsoever is not to be avoided, as errors, which are incident oftentimes even to the best and most inquisitive of men, are not offences against God, and therefore not to be punished or restrained by men; but all such opinions in which the public interests of the commonwealth, and the foundation of faith and a good life, are not concerned, are to be permitted freely. *Quisque abundet in sensu suo,* was the doctrine of S. Paul[t]; and that is argument and conclusion too: and they were excellent words which S. Ambrose[u] said in attestation of this great truth, *Nec imperiale est libertatem dicendi negare, nec sacerdotale quod sentias non dicere.*—I end with a story[x] which I find in the Jews' books. "When Abraham sat at his tent-door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers; he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travel, coming towards him, who was a hundred years of age.

[t] [Rom. xiv. 5, ed. vulg.]
[u] [epist. xl. § 2. tom. ii. col. 946 E.]
[x] [See an account of this story in Heber's life of Taylor, note XX.]

He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man eat and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, he asked him why he did not worship the God of heaven: the old man told him that he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other god; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was; he replied, 'I thrust him away because he did not worship Thee:' God answered him, 'I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonoured Me, and couldst not thou endure him one night when he gave thee no trouble?' Upon this" saith the story "Abraham fetched him back again and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction." Go thou and do likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham.

"Αγιος Ἰσχυρός.

ΧΡΙΣΙΣ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΤΙΚΗ.

A

DISCOURSE OF CONFIRMATION.

BY

JEREMY LORD BISHOP OF DOWN.

Acts xix. 2.

Εἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες;

[redacted]

TO

HIS GRACE

JAMES DUKE OF ORMOND,

LORD LIEUTENANT GENERAL,
AND GENERAL GOVERNOR OF HIS MAJESTY'S KINGDOM OF IRELAND,
ONE OF THE LORDS OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCILS
OF HIS MAJESTY'S KINGDOMS OF ENGLAND, SCOTLAND AND IRELAND, &c.,
AND KNIGHT OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

IT is not any confidence that I have dexterously performed this charge that gives me the boldness to present it to your grace. I have done it as well as I could, and for the rest my obedience will bear me out: for I took not this task upon myself, but was entreated to it by them who have power to command me. But yet it is very necessary that it should be addressed to your grace, who are, as Sozomen[a] said of Theodosius, *certaminum magister, et orationum judex constitutus:* you are appointed the great master of our arguings, and are most fit to be the judge of our discourses, especially when they do relate and pretend to public influence and advantages to the church. We all are witnesses of your zeal to promote true religion, and every day find you to be a great patron to this very poor church, which groans under the calamities and permanent effects of a war acted by intervals for above four hundred years; such which the intermedial sun-shines of peace could but very weakly repair. Our churches are still demolished, much of the revenues irrecoverably swallowed by sacrilege and digested by an unavoidable impunity; religion infinitely divided and parted into formidable sects; the people extremely ignorant and wilful by inheritance; superstitiously irreligious and uncapable of reproof. And amidst these and very many more inconveniences, it was greatly necessary that God should send us such a king, and he send us such a vice-roy, who weds the interests of religion and joins them to his heart.

For we do not look upon your grace only as a favourer of the church's temporal interest, though even for that the souls of the relieved clergy do daily bless you; neither are you our patron only as the Cretans were to Homer or the Aleuadæ to Simonides, Philip to Theopompus or Severus to Oppianus; but as Constantine and

[a] [In orat. ad Theod. p. 4 init.]

Theodosius were to Christians; that is, desirous that true religion should be promoted, that the interest of souls should be advanced, that truth should flourish and wise principles should be entertained, as the best cure against those evils which this nation hath too often brought upon themselves. In order to which excellent purposes it is hoped that the reduction of the holy rite of confirmation into use and holy practice may contribute some very great moments. For besides that the great usefulness of this ministry will greatly endear the episcopal order, to which (that I may use S. Hierome's[b] words) "if there be not attributed a more than common power and authority, there will be as many schisms as priests;" it will also be a means of endearing the persons of the prelates to their flocks, when the people shall be convinced that there is, or may be if they please, a perpetual entercourse of blessings and love between them; when God by their holy hands refuses not to give to the people the earnest of an eternal inheritance, when by them He blesses; and that "the grace of our Lord Jesus, and the love of God, and the communication of His spirit," is conveyed to all persons capable of the grace, by the conduct and on the hands and prayers of their bishops.

And indeed not only very many single persons, but even the whole church of Ireland hath need of confirmation. We have most of us contended for false religions and unchristian propositions; and now that by God's mercy and the prosperity and piety of his sacred majesty the church is broken from her cloud, and many are reduced to the true religion and righteous worship of God, we cannot but call to mind how the holy fathers of the primitive church often have declared themselves in councils, and by a perpetual discipline, that such persons who are returned from sects and heresies into the bosom of the church should not be rebaptized, but that the bishops should impose hands on them in confirmation. It is true that this was designed to supply the defect of those schismatical conventicles who did not use this holy rite; for this rite of confirmation hath had the fate to be opposed only by the schismatical and puritan parties of old, the Novatians or Cathari, and the Donatists; and of late by the Jesuits and new Cathari, the puritans and presbyterians; the same evil spirit of contradiction keeping its course in the same channel and descending regularly amongst men of the same principles. But therefore in the restitution of a man, or company of men, or a church, the holy primitives in the council of C. P., Laodicea, and Orange, thought that to confirm such persons was the most agreeable discipline, not only because such persons did not in their little and dark assemblies use this rite, but because they always greatly wanted it. For it is a sure rule in our religion and is of an eternal truth, that 'they who keep not the unity of the church have not the Spirit of God;' and therefore it is most fit should receive the ministry of the Spirit when they return to the bosom of the church, that so indeed

[b] [p. 131, not. b, supra.]

they may keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. And therefore Asterius[b] bishop of Amasia compares confirmation to the ring with which the father of the prodigal adorned his returning son; *Datur nempe prodigo post stolam et annulus, nempe symbolum intelligibilis signaculi Spiritus.* And as the Spirit of God, the holy Dove, extended His mighty wings over the creation, and hatched the new-born world from its seminal powers to light and operation and life and motion; so in the regeneration of the souls of men He gives a new being, and heat and life, procedure and perfection, wisdom and strength: and because that this was ministered by the bishop's hands in confirmation, was so firmly believed by all the primitive church, therefore it became a law and an universal practice in all those ages in which men desired to be saved by all means. The Latin church and the Greek always did use it, and the blessings of it, which they believed consequent to it, they expressed in a holy prayer which in the Greek *Euchologion*[c] they have very anciently and constantly used, "Thou, O Lord, the most compassionate and great King of all, graciously impart to this person the seal of the gift of Thy holy, almighty, and adorable Spirit." For, as an ancient Greek said truly and wisely[d], "the Father is reconciled, and the Son is the reconciler; but to them who are by baptism and repentance made friends of God, the Holy Spirit is collated as a gift." They well knew what they received in this ministration, and therefore wisely laid hold of it and would not let it go.

This was anciently ministered by apostles, and ever after by the bishops, and religiously received by kings and greatest princes; and I have read that S. Sylvester confirmed Constantine the emperor: and when they made their children servants of the holy Jesus and soldiers under His banner and bonds-men of His institution, then they sent them to the bishop to be confirmed; who did it sometimes by such ceremonies that the solemnity of the ministry might with greatest religion addict them to the service of their great Lord. We read in Adrevaldus[e] that Charles Martel entering into a league with bishop Liutprandus sent his son Pepin to him, *ut more christianorum fidelium ejus capillum primus attonderet ac pater illi spiritualis existeret,* that he might after the manner of Christians first cut his hair (in token of service to Christ) and (in confirming him) he should be his spiritual father. And something like this we find concerning William earl of Warren and Surrey[f], who when he had dedicated the church of S. Pancratius and the priory of Lewes, received confirmation and

[b] [Apud Photium, biblioth. cod. 271. p. 502, 5.]

[c] [Goar, p. 355.] Αὐτὸς δέσποτα, παμβασιλεῦ, εὐσπλαγχνε, χαρίσαι αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ παντοδυνάμου καὶ προσκυνητοῦ σου Πνεύματος.

[d] Ὁ μὲν Πατὴρ διήλλακται, ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς διήλλαξε, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον φίλοις ἤδη καταστᾶσι δῶρον.

[e] De miraculis S. Benedict., lib. i. c. 14. [apud Joann. a Bosco, biblioth. Floriac., p. 31. 8vo. Lugd. 1605.]

[f] [Dugdale, Monast. Angl., tom. v. p. 15, from Cotton MSS.]

gave seisure *per capillos capitis mei* (says he in the charter) *et fratris mei Radulphi de Warrena, quos abscidit cum cultello de capitibus nostris Henricus episcopus Wintoniensis;* 'by the hairs of my head and of my brother's, which Henry bishop of Winchester cut off before the altar:' meaning (according to the ancient custom) in confirmation, when they by that solemnity addicted themselves to the free servitude of the Lord Jesus. The ceremony is obsolete and changed, but the mystery can never. And indeed that is one of the advantages in which we can rejoice concerning the ministration of this rite in the church of England and Ireland, that whereas it was sometimes clouded, sometimes hindered, and sometimes hurt, by the appendage of needless and useless ceremonies, it is now reduced to the primitive and first simplicity amongst us, and the excrescencies used in the church of Rome are wholly pared away, and by holy prayers and the apostolical ceremony of imposition of the bishop's hands it is worthily and zealously administered. The Latins used to send chrism to the Greeks when they had usurped some jurisdiction over them, and the pope's chaplains went with a quantity of it to C.P. where the Russians usually met them for it; for that was then the ceremony of this ministration: but when the Latins demanded fourscore pounds of gold besides other gifts, they went away, and changed their custom rather than pay an unlawful and ungodly tribute. *Non quærimus vestra, sed vos;* we require nothing but leave to impart God's blessings with pure intentions and a spiritual ministry. And as the bishops of our churches receive nothing from the people for the ministration of this rite, so they desire nothing but love and just obedience in spiritual and ecclesiastical duties; and we offer our flocks spiritual things without mixture of temporal advantages from them; we minister the rituals of the gospel without the inventions of men, religion without superstition, and only desire to be believed in such things which we prove from scripture expounded by the catholic practice of the church of God.

Concerning the subject of this discourse, the Rite of Confirmation, it were easy to recount many great and glorious expressions which we find in the sermons of the holy fathers of the primitive ages: so certain it is that in this thing we ought to be zealous, as being desirous to persuade our people to give us leave to do them great good. But the following pages will do it I hope competently: only we shall remark, that when they had gotten a custom anciently that in cases of necessity they did permit deacons and laymen sometimes to baptize, yet they never did confide in it much, but with much caution and curiosity commanded that such persons should, when that necessity was over, be carried to the bishop to be confirmed, so to supply all precedent defects relating to the past imperfect ministry, and future necessity and danger; as appears in the council of Eliberis[s]. And the ancients had so great estimate and veneration to this holy

[s] [Can. 77. tom. i. col. 257.]

rite, that as in heraldry they distinguish the same thing by several names when they relate to persons of greater eminency, and they blazon the arms of the gentry by metals, of the nobility by precious stones, but of kings and princes by planets: so when they would signify the unction which was used in confirmation, they gave it a special word, and of more distinction and remark; and therefore the oil used in baptism they called ἔλαιον, but that of confirmation was μύρον καὶ χρίσμα· and they who spake properly kept this difference of words, until by incaution and ignorant carelessness the names fell into confusion, and the thing into disuse and disrespect. But it is no small addition to the honour of this ministration that some wise and good men have piously believed, that when baptized Christians are confirmed and solemnly blessed by the bishop, that then it is that a special angel-guardian is appointed to keep their souls from the assaults of the spirits of darkness. Concerning which though I shall not interpose mine own opinion, yet this I say, that the piety of that supposition is not disagreeable to the intention of this rite: for since by this the Holy Spirit of God (the Father of spirits) is given, it is not unreasonably thought by them that the other good spirits of God, the angels who are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to the good of them that shall be heirs of salvation, should pay their kind offices in subordination to their prince and fountain; that the first in every kind might be the measure of all the rest. But there are greater and stranger things than this that God does for the souls of His servants, and for the honour of the ministries which Himself hath appointed.

We shall only add that this was ancient, and long before popery entered into the world, and that this rite hath been more abused by popery than by any thing: and to this day the bigots of the Roman church are the greatest enemies to it; and from them the presbyterians. But besides that the church of England and Ireland does religiously retain it, and hath appointed a solemn officer[h] for the ministry; the Lutheran and Bohemian churches do observe it carefully, and it is recommended and established in the Harmony of the Protestant Confessions.

And now may it please your grace to give me leave to implore your aid and countenance for the propagating this so religious and useful a ministry, which, as it is a peculiar of the bishop's office, is also a great enlarger of God's gifts to the people. It is a great instrument of union of hearts, and will prove an effective deletery to schism, and an endearment to the other parts of religion: it is the consummation of baptism, and a preparation to the Lord's supper: it is the virtue from on high, and the solemnity of our spiritual adoption. But there will be no need to use many arguments to enflame your zeal in this affair, when your grace shall find that to promote it will be a great service to God; for this alone will conclude

[h] [sic edd.]

your grace, who are so ready, by laws and executions, by word and by example, to promote the religion of Christ, as it is taught in these churches. I am not confident enough to desire your grace for the reading this discourse to lay aside any one hour of your greater employments, which consume so much of your days and nights: but I say that the subject is greatly worthy of consideration. *Nihil enim inter manus habui, cui majorem sollicitudinem præstare deberem.* And for the book itself, I can only say what Secundus[h] did to the wise Lupercus, *Quoties ad fastidium legentium deliciasque respicio, intelligo nobis commendationem ex ipsa mediocritate libri petendam,* 'I can commend it because it is little, and so not very troublesome.' And if it could have been written according to the worthiness of the thing treated in it, it would deserve so great a patronage: but because it is not, it will therefore greatly need it; but it can hope for it on no other account but because it is laid at the feet of a princely person, who is great and good, and one who not only is bound by duty, but by choice hath obliged himself to do advantages to any worthy instrument of religion. But I have detained your grace so long in my address, that your pardon will be all the favour which ought to be hoped for by

your grace's most humble
and obliged servant,

JER. DUNENSIS.

[h] [Plin., lib. ii. epist. 5.]

A

DISCOURSE OF CONFIRMATION.

THE INTRODUCTION.

NEXT to the incarnation of the Son of God and the whole economy of our redemption wrought by Him in an admirable order and conjugation of glorious mercies, the greatest thing that ever God did to the world is the giving to us the Holy Ghost; and possibly this is the consummation and perfection of the other. For in the work of redemption Christ indeed made a new world; we are wholly a new creation, and we must be so: and therefore when S. John began the narrative of the gospel, he began in a manner and style very like to Moses in his history of the first creation; "In the beginning was the Word," &c. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made." But as in the creation the matter was first; there were indeed heavens and earth and waters, but all this was rude and "without form," till "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters:" so it is in the new creation. We are a new mass, redeemed with the blood of Christ, rescued from an evil portion and made candidates of heaven and immortality; but we are but an embryo in the regeneration until the Spirit of God enlivens us and moves again upon the waters, and then every subsequent motion and operation is from the Spirit of God. "We cannot say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost;" by Him we live, in Him we walk, by His aids we pray, by His emotions we desire; we breathe, and sigh, and groan by Him; He 'helps' us in all 'our infirmities,' and He gives us all our strengths; He reveals mysteries to us and teaches us all our duties; He stirs us up to holy desires and He actuates those desires; He "makes us to will and to do of His good pleasure."

For the Spirit of God is that in our spiritual life that a man's soul is in his natural, without it we are but a dead and lifeless trunk. But then as a man's soul in proportion to the several operations of life obtains several appellatives; it is vegetative and nutritive, sensitive and intellective, according as it operates: so is the Spirit of God. He is the spirit of regeneration in baptism, of renovation in repentance; the spirit of love and the spirit of holy fear; the searcher of the hearts and the spirit of discerning; the spirit of wisdom and

the spirit of prayer. In one mystery He illuminates and in another He feeds us; He begins in one and finishes and perfects in another. It is the same spirit working divers operations. For He is all this now reckoned and He is every thing else that is the principle of good unto us; He is the beginning and the progression, the consummation and perfection of us all; and yet every work of His is perfect in its kind and in order to His own designation, and from the beginning to the end is perfection all the way. Justifying and sanctifying grace is the proper entitative product in all, but it hath divers appellatives and connotations in the several rites; and yet even then also because of the identity of the principle, the similitude and general consonancy in the effect, the same appellative is given, and the same effect imputed to more than one; and yet none of them can be omitted, when the great master of the family hath blessed it and given it institution. Thus S. Dionys[a] calls baptism *τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς θεογονίας πλείωσιν*, 'the perfection of the divine birth;' and yet the baptized person must receive other mysteries which are more signally perfective: *ἡ τοῦ μύρου χρίσις τελειωτική*· confirmation is yet more 'perfective,' and is properly the perfection of baptism.

By baptism we are heirs, and are adopted to the inheritance of sons, admitted to the covenant of repentance, and engaged to live a good life; yet this is but the solemnity of the covenant, which must pass into after-acts by other influences of the same divine principle. Until we receive the spirit of obsignation or confirmation, we are but 'babes in Christ' in the meanest sense, infants that can do nothing, that cannot speak, that cannot resist any violence, exposed to every rudeness and perishing by every temptation.

But therefore as God at first appointed us a ministry of a new birth, so also hath He given to His church the consequent ministry of a new strength. The Spirit moved a little upon the waters of baptism, and gave us the principles of life, but in confirmation He makes us able to move ourselves. In the first He is the spirit of life, but in this He is the spirit of strength and motion. *Baptisma est nativitas, unguentum vero est nobis actionis instar et motus*, said Cabasilas[b]. 'In baptism we are intitled to the inheritance; but because we are in our infancy and minority, the father gives unto his sons a tutor, a guardian and a teacher in confirmation,' said Rupertus[c]: that as we are baptized into the death and resurrection of Christ, so in confirmation we may be renewed in the inner man, and strengthened in all our holy vows and purposes by the Holy Ghost ministered according to God's ordinance.

The holy rite of confirmation is a divine ordinance, and it produces

[a] [Eccles. hier., cap. ii. p. 85 C.]

[b] [De vit. in Christo, lib. ii. prop. init.—Magn. biblioth. vett. patr., tom. xiv. p. 106.—'Baptismus enim est generatio sive ortus; unguentum sive chrisma actionis et motionis rationem habet.']

[c] De divin. offic., l. v. c. 17. [leg. 16. p. 655.—'Quid prodest si quisquam parentum magnam parvulo conferat hæreditatem, nisi provideat illi tutorem? Paracletus quippe regeneratis in Christo custos et consolator et tutor est,' &c.]

divine effects and is ministered by divine persons, that is, by those whom God hath sanctified and separated to this ministration. At first all that were baptized were also confirmed, and ever since all good people that have understood it have been very zealous for it; and time was in England, even since the first beginnings of the Reformation, when confirmation had been less carefully ministered for about six years, when the people had their first opportunities of it restored, they ran to it in so great numbers that churches and churchyards would not hold them; insomuch that I have read[d] that the bishop of Chester was forced to impose hands on the people in the fields, and was so oppressed with multitudes that he had almost been trod to death by the people, and had died with the throng if he had not been rescued by the civil power.

But men have too much neglected all the ministries of grace, and this most especially, and have not given themselves to a right understanding of it, and so neglected it yet more. But because the prejudice which these parts of the christian church have suffered for want of it is very great (as will appear by enumeration of the many and great blessings consequent to it) I am not without hope that it may be a service acceptable to God, and an useful ministry to the souls of my charges, if by instructing them that know not, and exhorting them that know, I set forward the practice of this holy rite, and give reason why the people ought to love it and to desire it, and how they are to understand and practise it, and consequently with what duteous affections they are to relate to those persons whom God hath in so special and signal manner made to be, for their good and eternal benefit, the ministers of the Spirit and salvation.

S. Bernard[e], in the life of S. Malachias, my predecessor in the see of Down and Connor, reports that it was the care of that good prelate to renew the rite of confirmation in his diocese, where it had been long neglected and gone into desuetude. It being too much our case in Ireland, I find the same necessity, and am obliged to the same procedure, for the same reason, and in pursuance of so excellent an example. *Hoc est enim evangelizare Christum,* said S. Austin[f], *non tantum docere quæ sunt dicenda*[g] *de Christo, sed etiam quæ observanda ei qui accedit ad compagem corporis Christi,* 'for this is to preach the gospel, not only to teach those things which are to be said of Christ, but those also which are to be observed by every one who desires to be confederated into the society of the body of Christ, which is His church; that is, not only the doctrines of good life, but the mysteries of godliness and the rituals of religion, which issue

[d] Vindic. ecclesiast. hierarch. per Franc. Hallier. [lib. ii. cap. 5. § 2. p. 125. 4to. Paris. 1632.—è Sandero, schism. Angl., lib. ii.—It may here be mentioned once for all, that Taylor's authorities in this treatise are often taken from Hallier's work; to which therefore reference will sometimes be made in the following notes.]

[e] [col. 1932 K.]

[f] Cap. ix. De fide et operibus. [tom. vi. col. 172.]

[g] [al. 'dicere quæ sunt credenda.']

from a divine fountain, are to be declared by him who would fully preach the gospel.

In order to which performance I shall declare,

1. The divine original, warranty and institution of the holy rit of confirmation.

2. That this rite was to be a perpetual and never ceasing ministration.

3. That it was actually continued and practised by all the succeeding ages of the purest and primitive churches.

4. That this rite was appropriate to the ministry of bishops.

5. That prayer and imposition of the bishop's hands did make the whole ritual; and though other things were added, yet they were not necessary, or any thing of the institution.

6. That many great graces and blessings were consequent to the worthy reception and due ministration of it.

7. I shall add something of the manner of preparation to it, and reception of it.

§ 1. Of the divine original, warranty and institution of the holy rite of confirmation.

In the church of Rome they have determined confirmation to be a sacrament *proprii nominis*, properly and really; and yet their doctors have, some of them at least, been *paulo iniquiores*, a little unequal and unjust to their proposition, insomuch that from themselves we have had the greatest opposition in this article. Bonacina[h] and Henriquez[i] allow the proposition, but make the sacrament to be so unnecessary that a little excuse may justify the omission and almost neglect of it. And Loëmelius and Daniel à Jesu, and generally the English Jesuits, have, to serve some ends of their own family and order, disputed it almost into contempt, that by representing it as unnecessary, they might do all the ministries ecclesiastical in England without the assistance of bishops their superiors, whom they therefore love not, because they are so. But the theological faculty of Paris have condemned their doctrine as temerarious and savouring of heresy; and in the later schools[k] have approved rather the doctrine of Gamachæus, Estius, Kellison, and Bellarmine, who indeed do follow the doctrine of the most eminent persons in the ancient school, Richard of Armagh, Scotus, Hugo Cavalli, and Gerson the learned chancellor of Paris, who following the old Roman order, Amalarius and Albinus, do all teach confirmation to be of great and pious use, of divine original, and to many purposes necessary, according to the doctrine of the scriptures and the primitive church.

Whether confirmation be a sacrament or no, is of no use to dispute; and if it be disputed, it can never be proved to be so as

[h] De Sacram., disp. 3. qu. unic. punct. 3. [leg. 2. vid. Hallier, p. 112.]

[i] Lib. 3. De sacram. [i. e. de sacr. confirm., c. i.—Hallier, p. 115.]

[k] [Hallier, p. 116.]

baptism and the Lord's supper, that is, 'as generally necessary to salvation;' but though it be no sacrament, it cannot follow that it is not of very great use and holiness: and as a man is never the less tied to repentance, though it be no sacrament; so neither is he ever the less obliged to receive confirmation, though it be (as it ought) acknowledged to be of an use and nature inferior to the two sacraments of divine, direct and immediate institution. It is certain that the fathers in a large symbolical and general sense call it a sacrament, but mean not the same thing by that word when they apply it to confirmation as they do when they apply it to baptism and the Lord's supper. That it is an excellent and divine ordinance to purposes spiritual, that it comes from God and ministers in our way to God, that is all we are concerned to enquire after: and this I shall endeavour to prove not only against the Jesuits, but against all opponents of what side soever.

1. My first argument from scripture is what I learn from Optatus and S. Cyril. Optatus[1] writing against the Donatists hath these words, "Christ descended into the water, not that in Him, who is God, was any thing that could be made cleaner, but that the water was to precede the future unction, for the initiating and ordaining and fulfilling the mysteries of baptism. He was washed when He was in the hands of John; then followed the order of the mystery, and the Father finished what the Son did ask, and what the Holy Ghost declared: the heavens were opened, God the Father anointed Him, the spiritual unction presently descended in the likeness of a dove, and sate upon His head, and was spread all over Him, and He was called the Christ when He was the anointed of the Father. To whom also lest imposition of hands should seem to be wanting, the voice of God was heard from the cloud saying, 'This is My Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him.'" That which Optatus says is this; that upon and in Christ's person, baptism, confirmation and ordination were consecrated and first appointed. He was baptized by S. John; He was confirmed by the Holy Spirit, and anointed with spiritual unction in order to that great work of obedience to His Father's will; and He was consecrated by the voice of God from heaven. In all things Christ is the head and the first-fruits; and in these things was the fountain of the sacraments and spiritual grace, and the great exemplar of the economy of the church. For Christ was *nullius pœnitentiæ debitor*[m]; baptism of repentance was not necessary to Him, who never sinned; but so it became Him to fulfil all righteousness, and to be a pattern to us all. But we have need of these things, though He had not; and in the same way in which salvation was wrought by Him for Himself and for us all, in the same way He intended[n] we should walk. He was baptized because His Father appointed it so; we must be baptized because

[1] [lib. iv. cap. vii.] [m] [Tertull. De bapt., cap. xii. p. 229 A.] [n] 1 John ii. 8 [? 6.]

Christ hath appointed it, and we have need of it too. He was consecrated to be the great prophet and the great priest, because "no man takes on him this honour but he that was called of God, as was Aaron:" and all they who are to minister in His prophetical office under Him must be consecrated and solemnly set apart for that ministration, and after His glorious example. He was anointed with a spiritual unction from above after His baptism; for "after Jesus was baptized," He ascended up from the waters, and then the Holy Ghost descended upon Him. It is true He received the fulness of the Spirit; but we receive Him by measure; but "of His fulness we all receive, grace for grace:" that is, all that He received in order to His great work, all that in kind, one for another, grace for grace, we are to receive according to our measures and our necessities. And as all these He received by external ministrations, so must we; God the Father appointed His way, and He by His example first hath appointed the same to us, that we also may 'follow Him in the regeneration,' and 'work out our salvation' by the same graces in the like solemnities. For if He needed them for Himself, then we need them much more. If He did not need them for Himself, He needed them for us, and for our example, that we might follow His steps, who by receiving these exterior solemnities and inward graces became 'the author and finisher' of our salvation, and the great example of His church. I shall not need to make use of the fancy of the Murcosians and Colabarsians[o], who turning all mysteries into numbers, reckoned the numeral letters of περιστερὰ, and made them coincident to the α and ω· but they intended to say that Christ receiving the holy Dove after His baptism became all in all to us, the beginning and the perfection of our salvation; here He was confirmed, and received the ω to His α, the consummation to His initiation, the completion of His baptism and of His headship in the gospel.—But that which I shall rather add is what S. Cyril[p] from hence argues, "When He truly was baptized in the river of Jordan, He ascended out of the waters, and the Holy Ghost substantially descended upon Him, like resting upon like. And to you also in like manner, after ye have ascended from the waters of baptism, the unction is given, which bears the image or similitude of Him by whom Christ was anointed; that as Christ after baptism and the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Him went forth to battle (in the wilderness) and overcame the adversary; so ye also, after holy baptism and the mystical unction (or confirmation) being vested with the armour of the Holy Spirit, are enabled to stand against the opposite powers." Here then is the first great ground of our solemn receiving the Holy Spirit, or the unction from above after baptism, which we understand and represent by the word confirmation, denot-

[o] [See Irenæus, hær., lib. i. cap. 13 sq., of the doctrines of Marcus and Colorbasus.]

[p] Cateches. iii. [sc. xxi. seu Mystag. iii. p. 316.] Πνεύματος ἁγίου οὐσιώδης ἐπιφοίτησις αὐτῷ ἐγίνετο.

ing the principal effect of this unction, spiritual strength. Christ, who is the head of the church, entered this way upon His duty and work, and He who was the first of all the church, the head and great example, is the measure of all the rest, for we can go to heaven no way but in that way in which He went before us.

There are some who from this story would infer the descent of the Holy Ghost after Christ's baptism not to signify that confirmation was to be a distinct rite from baptism, but a part of it, yet such a part as gives fulness and consummation to it. S. Hierome, Chrysostom, Euthymius and Theophylact go not so far, but would have us by this to understand that the Holy Ghost is given to them that are baptized. But reason and the context are both against it. 1) Because the Holy Ghost was not given by John's baptism; that was reserved to be one of Christ's glories; who also, when by His disciples He baptized many, did not give them the Holy Ghost; and when He commanded His apostles to baptize all nations, did not at that time so much as promise the Holy Ghost: He was promised distinctly, and given, by another ministration. 2) The descent of the Holy Spirit was a distinct ministry from the baptism; it was not only after Jesus ascended from the waters of baptism, but there was something intervening, and by a new office or ministration, for there was prayer joined in the ministry. So S. Luke observes. "While Jesus was praying, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended;" for so Jesus was pleased to consign the whole office and ritual of confirmation: prayer for invocating the Holy Spirit, and giving Him by personal application; which as the Father did immediately, so the bishops do by imposition of hands. 3) S. Austin[q] observes that the apparition of the Holy Spirit like a dove was the visible or ritual part, and the voice of God was the word to make it to be sacramental; *accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum;* for so the ministration was not only performed on Christ, but consigned to the church by similitude and exemplar institution.—I shall only add that the force of this argument is established to us by more of the fathers. S. Hilary[r] upon this place hath these words, "The Father's voice was heard, that from those things which were consummated in Christ we might know that after the baptism of water the Holy Spirit from the gates of heaven flies unto us; and that we are to be anointed[s] with the unction of a celestial glory, and be made the sons of God by the adoption of the voice of God, the truth by the very effects of things prefigured unto us the similitude of a sacrament." So S. Chrysostom[t]; "In the beginnings always appears the sensible visions of spiritual things, for their sakes who cannot receive the

[q] In Joan. tract. lxxx. [tom. iii. part. 2. col. 703 C.]

[r] S. Hilar. can. iv. [leg. ii.] in fine. [col. 617.]

[s] [lat. sic; . . . 'et cœlestis nos gloriæ unctione perfundi, et paternæ vocis adoptione Dei filios fieri; cum ita dispositi in nos sacramenti imaginem ipsis rerum effectibus veritas præfiguraverit.']

[t] In Matthæum. [hom. xii. tom. vii. p. 163 C.]

understanding of an incorporeal nature; that if afterwards they be not so done (that is, after the same visible manner) they may be believed by those things which were already done." But more plain is that of Theophylact[u], "The Lord had not need of the descent of the Holy Spirit, but He did all things for our sakes; and Himself is become the first fruits of all things which we afterwards were to receive, that He might become the first fruits among many brethren." The consequent is this, which I express in the words of S. Austin[x], affirming, *Christi in baptismo columbam unctionem nostram præfigurasse*, 'the dove in Christ's baptism did represent and prefigure our unction' from above, that is, the descent of the Holy Ghost upon us in the rite of confirmation. Christ was baptized and so must we: but after baptism He had a new ministration for the reception of the Holy Ghost; and because this was done for our sakes, we also must follow that example. And this being done immediately before His entrance into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, it plainly describes to us the order of this ministry, and the blessing designed to us: after we are baptized, we need to be strengthened and confirmed *propter pugnam spiritualem;* we are to fight against the flesh, the world and the devil, and therefore must receive the ministration of the Holy Spirit of God: which is the design and proper work of confirmation. "For" (they are the words of the excellent author of the imperfect work upon S. Matthew, imputed to S. Chrysostom[y]) "the baptism of water profits us, because it washes away the sins we have formerly committed, if we repent of them; but it does not sanctify the soul, nor precedes the concupiscences of the heart and our evil thoughts, nor drives them back, nor represses our carnal desires. But he therefore who is (only) so baptized that he does not also receive the Holy Spirit, is baptized in his body, and his sins are pardoned, but in his mind he is yet but a catechumen; for so it is written, 'He that hath not the Spirit of Christ is none of His;' and therefore afterwards out of his flesh will germinate worse sins, because he hath not received the Holy Spirit conserving him (in his baptismal grace) but the house of his body is empty; wherefore that wicked spirit finding it swept with the doctrines of faith as with besoms, enters in, and in a sevenfold manner dwells there." Which words, besides that they well explicate this mystery, do also declare the necessity of confirmation, or receiving the Holy Ghost after baptism, in imitation of the divine precedent of our blessed Saviour.

2. After the example of Christ, my next argument is from His words spoken to Nicodemus in explication of the prime mysteries evangelical, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Holy Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God." These words are the great argument which the church uses for the indispensable necessity of baptism; and having in them so great effort, and not being rightly

[u] Ibid. [leg. In Marc. i. 10.]
[x] [vid. in Joan. tract. vi. per tot.— tom. iii. part. 2. col. 330 sqq.]
[y] Homil. iv. [tom. vi. append. p. 38.]

understood, they have suffered many—convulsions shall I call them, or interpretations? Some serve their own hypothesis by saying that water is the symbol, and the spirit is the baptismal grace; others that it is a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, one is only meant, though here be two signatures: but others conclude that water is only necessary, but the Spirit is super-added as being afterwards to supervene and move upon these waters; and others yet affirm that by water is only meant a spiritual ablution, or the effect produced by the Spirit; and still they have intangled the words so that they have been made useless to the christian church, and the meaning too many things makes nothing to be understood. But truth is easy, intelligible and clear, and without objection, and is plainly this:—

Unless a man be baptized into Christ and confirmed by the Spirit of Christ, he cannot enter into the kingdom of Christ; that is, he is not perfectly adopted into the christian religion, or fitted for the christian warfare. And if this plain and natural sense be admitted, the place is not only easy and intelligible, but consonant to the whole design of Christ and analogy of the New testament; for,

First, our blessed Saviour was catechizing of Nicodemus and teaching him the first rudiments of the gospel, and like a wise masterbuilder first lays the foundation, the doctrines of baptism and laying on of hands; which afterwards S. Paul put into the christian catechism, as I shall shew in the sequel. Now these also are the first principles of the christian religion taught by Christ himself, and things which at least to the doctors might have been so well known, that our blessed Saviour upbraids the not knowing them as a shame to Nicodemus. S. Chrysostom[a] and Theophylact[a], Euthymius[b] and Rupertus[c] affirm that this generation by water and the Holy Spirit might have been understood by the Old testament in which Nicodemus was so well skilled. Certain it is the doctrine of baptisms was well enough known to the Jews; and the ἐπιφοίτησις τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the illumination and irradiations of the Spirit of God was not new to them, who believed the visions and dreams, the 'daughter of a voice[d],' and the influences from heaven upon the sons of the prophets: and therefore although Christ intended to teach him more than what he had distinct notice of, yet the things themselves had foundation in the law and the prophets: but although they were high mysteries and scarce discerned by them who either were ignorant or incurious of such things; yet to the christians they were the very rudiments of their religion, and are best expounded by observation of what S. Paul placed in the very foundation. But,

Secondly, baptism is the first mystery, that is certain; but that this of being born of the Spirit is also the next, is plain in the very order of the words: and that it does mean a mystery distinct from baptism,

[a] [In Joan. hom. xxvi. tom. viii. p. 151.]
[a] [In loc. p. 594.]
[b] [In loc. tom. iii. p. 101.]
[c] [In loc. tom. ii. p. 247.]
[d] [בַּת-קוֹל.—See Buxtorf in בַּת.]

will be easily assented to by them who consider, that although Christ baptized and made many disciples by the ministry of His apostles, yet they who were so baptized into Christ's religion did not receive this baptism of the Spirit till after Christ's ascension.

Thirdly, the baptism of water was not peculiar to John the baptist, for it was also of Christ and ministered by His command; it was common to both, and therefore the baptism of water is the less principal here: something distinct from it is here intended. Now if we add to these words, that S. John tells of another baptism which was Christ's peculiar, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" that these words were literally verified upon the apostles in Pentecost, and afterwards upon all the baptized in spiritual effect, who besides the baptism of water distinctly had the baptism of the spirit in confirmation; it will follow that of necessity this must be the meaning and the verification of these words of our blessed Saviour to Nicodemus, which must mean a double baptism: *transibimus per aquam et ignem antequam veniemus in refrigerium*, 'we must pass through water and fire before we enter into rest;' that is, we must first be baptized with water and then with the Holy Ghost, who first descended in fire; that is, the only way to enter into Christ's kingdom is by these two doors of the 'tabernacle which God hath pitched and not man,' first by baptism, and then by confirmation; first by water, and then by the Spirit.

The primitive church had this notion so fully amongst them, that the author of the apostolical constitutions attributed to S. Clement[d], who was S. Paul's scholar, affirms that a man is made a perfect christian (meaning ritually and sacramentally, and by all exterior solemnity) by the water of baptism and confirmation of the bishop, and from these words of Christ now alleged derives the use and institution of the rite of confirmation. The same sense of these words is given to us by S. Cyprian[e], who intending to prove the insufficiency of one without the other, says, *Tunc enim plene sanctificari et esse Dei filii possunt si sacramento utroque nascantur, cum scriptum sit, Nisi quis natus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu non potest intrare in regnum Dei*, 'then they may be fully sanctified and become the sons of God, if they be born with both the sacraments or rites; for it is written, 'Unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'" The same also is the commentary of Eusebius Emissenus[f]; and S. Austin[g] tells that although some understand these words only of baptism, and others of the Spirit only, viz. in confirmation; yet others (and certainly much better) understand *utrumque sacramentum*, 'both the mysteries,' of confirmation as well as baptism. Amalarius Fortunatus[h] brings this

[d] S. Clem. ep. iv. [ad Julium et Julianum. fol. 76. ed. fol. Par. 1544.]—Constit. apost. [lib. iii. cap. 17.]

[e] Ad Stephanum. [ep. lxxxii. p. 196.]

[f] Homil. in dominic. prim. post Ascens. [p. 687 sqq.]

[g] Epist. cviii. [al. cclxv.] ad Seleucianum. [tom. ii. col. 896.]

[h] Lib. i. c. 27. [p. 322.]

very text to reprove them that neglect the episcopal imposition of hands; "Concerning them who by negligence lose the bishop's presence, and receive not the imposition of his hands, it is to be considered, lest in justice they be condemned, in which they exercise justice negligently, because they ought to make haste to the imposition of hands; because Christ said, 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:' and as He said this, so also He said, 'Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"

To this I foresee two objections may be made.

First, that Christ did not institute confirmation in this place, because confirmation being for the gift of the Holy Ghost, who was to come upon none of the apostles till Jesus was glorified, these words seem too early for the consigning an effect that was to be so long after, and a rite that could not be practised till many intermedial events should happen. So said the evangelist[k], "The Holy Ghost was come upon none of them, because Jesus was not yet glorified;" intimating that this great effect was to be in after-time: and it is not likely that the ceremony should be ordained before the effect itself was ordered and provided for; that the solemnity should be appointed before provisions were made for the mystery; and that the outward, which was wholly for the inward, should be instituted before the inward and principal had its abode amongst us.

To this I answer, first, that it is no unusual thing; for Christ gave the sacrament of His body before His body was given; the memorial of His death was instituted before His death.—Secondly, confirmation might here as well be instituted as baptism, and by the same reason that the church from these words concludes the necessity of one, she may also infer the designation of the other; for the effect of baptism was at that time no more produced than that of confirmation. Christ had not yet purchased to Himself a church, He had not wrought remission of sins to all that believe on Him; the death of Christ was not yet passed, into which death the christian church was to be baptized.—Thirdly, these words are so an institution of confirmation, as the sixth chap. of S. John is of the blessed eucharist: it was *designativa*, not *ordinativa*, it was in design, not in present command; here it was preached, but not reducible to practice till its proper season.—Fourthly, it was like the words of Christ to S. Peter, "When thou art converted, confirm thy brethren:" here the command was given, but that confirmation of his brethren was to be performed in a time relative to a succeeding accident.—Fifthly, it is certain that long before the event and grace was given, Christ did speak of the spirit of confirmation, that spirit which was to descend in Pentecost, which all they were to receive who should

[k] [John vii. 39.]

believe on Him, which whosoever did receive, out of his belly should flow rivers of living waters, as is to be read in that place of S. John[k] now quoted.—Sixthly, this predesignation of the holy spirit of confirmation was presently followed by some little antepast and *donariola*, or little givings of the Spirit; for our blessed Saviour gave the Holy Ghost three several times. First ἀμυδρῶς[l], 'obscurely' and by intimation and secret virtue, then when He sent them to heal the sick and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord. Secondly, ἐκτυποτέρως, 'more expressly' and signally after the resurrection, when He took His leave of them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" and this was to give them a power of ministering remission of sins, and therefore related to baptism and the ministries of repentance. But thirdly, He gave it τελειοτέρως, 'more perfectly,' and this was the spirit of confirmation; for He 'was not at all until now,' οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, says the text, 'the Holy Ghost was not yet:' so almost all the Greek copies printed and manuscript; and so S. Chrysostom, Athanasius, Cyril, Ammonius in the Catena of the Greeks, Leontius, Theophylact, Euthymius, and all the Greek fathers read it; so S. Hierome[m] and S. Austin[n] among the Latins, and some Latin translations read it. Our translations read it, 'the Holy Ghost was not yet given,' was not ἐν αὐτοῖς, 'in them,' as some few Greek copies read it: but the meaning is alike, confirmation was not yet actual, the Holy Spirit, viz. of confirmation, was not yet come upon the church: but it follows not but He was long before promised, designed and appointed, spoken of and declared. The first of these collations had the ceremony of chrism or anointing joined with it, which the church in process of time transferred into her use and ministry: yet it is the last only that Christ passed into an ordinance for ever; it is this only which is the sacramental consummation of our regeneration in Christ; for in this the Holy Spirit is not only ἐνεργείᾳ παρὸν, 'present by His power,' but present οὐσιωδῶς, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις συγγινόμενόν τε καὶ πολιτευόμενον, as S. Gregory Nazianzen[o] expresses it, to dwell with us, to converse with us, and to abide for ever; οὗ ἐξέχεε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως· so S. Paul describes this spirit of confirmation, the spirit 'which He hath poured forth upon us richly' or plentifully, that is, in great measures, and to the full consummation of the first mysteries of our regeneration. Now because Christ is the great fountain of this blessing to us, and He it was who sent His Father's spirit upon the church, Himself best knew His own intentions, and the great blessings He intended to communicate to His church, and therefore it was most agreeable that from His sermons we should learn His purposes and His blessing, and our duty. Here Christ declared *rem sacramenti*, the spiritual grace which He would afterwards impart to His

[k] [Chap. vii. 38.]

[l] [Greg. Naz. ut in not. o, infra.]

[m] Qu. ix. ad Hedibiam. [tom. iv. part. 1. col. 179.]

[n] In Joan., tract. xxii. [leg. xxxii. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 526.—But both authors have 'Nondum erat Spiritus datus.']

[o] [Orat. xli. cap. 11. tom. i. p. 740 A.]

church by exterior ministry, in this as in all other graces, mysteries and rituals evangelical: *Nisi quis*, 'unless a man be born both of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'

But the next objection is yet more material; for,

Secondly, if this be the meaning of our blessed Saviour, then confirmation is as necessary as baptism, and without it ordinarily no man can be saved. The solution of this will answer a case of conscience, concerning the necessity of confirmation; and in what degree of duty and diligence we are bound to take care that we receive this holy rite. I answer therefore, that entering into the kingdom of God is being admitted into the christian church and warfare, to become sons of God, and soldiers of Jesus Christ. And though this be the outward door and the first entrance into life, and consequently the king's high-way and the ordinary means of salvation; yet we are to distinguish the external ceremony from the internal mystery: the *Nisi quis* is for this, not for that; and yet that also is the ordinary way. Unless a man be baptized, that is, unless he be indeed regenerate, he cannot be saved: and yet baptism, or the outward washing, is the solemnity and ceremony of its ordinary ministration, and he that neglects this when it may be had is not indeed regenerate; he is not renewed in the spirit of his mind, because he neglects God's way, and therefore can as little be saved as he who, having received the external sacrament, puts a bar to the intromission of the inward grace. Both cannot always be had; but when they can, although they are not equally valuable in the nature of the thing, yet they are made equally necessary by the divine commandment. And in this there is a great but general mistake in the doctrine of the schools, disputing concerning what sacraments are necessary *necessitate medii*, that is, as necessary means, and what are necessary by the necessity of precept or divine commandment. For although a less reason will excuse from the actual susception of some than of others, and a less diligence for the obtaining of one will serve than in obtaining of another, and a supply in one is easier obtained than in another; yet no sacrament hath in it any other necessity than what is made merely by the divine commandment: but the grace of every sacrament or rite of mystery which is of divine ordinance is necessary indispensably, so as without it no man can be saved. And this difference is highly remarkable in the words of Christ recorded by S. Mark[p], "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Baptism itself, as to the external part, is not necessary *necessitate medii*, or indispensably; but baptismal faith for the remission of sins in persons capable, that indeed is necessary: for Christ does not say that the want of baptism damns as the want of faith does; and yet both baptism and faith are the ordinary way of salvation, and both necessary; baptism because it is so by the divine commandment, and faith as a necessary means of salvation, in the

[p] [Mark xvi. 16.]

very economy and dispensation of the gospel. Thus it is also in the other sacrament, "Unless we eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood we have no life in us[q]," and yet God forbid that every man that is not communicated should die eternally. But it means plainly that without receiving Christ, as He is by God's intention intended we should receive Him in the communion, we have no life in us; plainly thus,—Without the internal grace we cannot live, and the external ministry is the usual and appointed means of conveying to us the internal; and therefore although without the external it is possible to be saved when it is impossible to be had, yet with the wilful neglect of it we cannot. Thus therefore we are to understand the words of Christ declaring the necessity of both these ceremonies; they are both necessary, because they are the means of spiritual advantages and graces, and both minister to the proper ends of their appointment, and both derive from a divine original; but the ritual or ceremonial part in rare emergencies is dispensable, but the grace is indispensable. Without the grace of baptism we shall die in our sins; and without the grace or internal part of confirmation we shall never be able to resist the devil, but shall be taken captive by him at his will. Now the external or ritual part is the means, the season and opportunity of this grace; and therefore is at no hand to be neglected, lest we be accounted despisers of the grace, and tempters of God to ways and provisions extraordinary. For although when without our fault we receive not the sacramental part, God can and will supply it to us out of His own stores, because no man can perish without his own fault, and God can permit to Himself what He pleases, as being Lord of the grace and of the sacrament; yet to us He hath given a law and a rule, and that is the way of His church in which all christians ought to walk. In short, the use of it is greatly profitable, the neglect is inexcusable, but the contempt is damnable. *Tenentur non negligere si pateat opportunitas*, said the bishops in a synod at Paris[r], 'If there be an opportunity it must not be neglected.' *Obligantur suscipere, aut saltem non contemnere*, said the synod at Sens[r], 'They are bound to receive it, or at least not to despise it.' Now he despises it that refuses it when he is invited to it or when it is offered, or that neglects it without cause; for causelessly and contemptuously are all one. But these answers were made by gentle casuists; he only values the grace that desires it, that longs for it, that makes use of all the means of grace, that seeks out for the means, that refuses no labour, that goes after them as the merchant goes after gain: and therefore the old *Ordo Romanus*[s] admonishes more strictly, *Omnino præcavendum esse ut hoc sacramentum confirmationis non negligatur, quia tunc omne baptisma legitimum christianitatis nomine confirmatur;* 'we must by all means

[q] John vi. [53.]

[r] [Bochell. decret. eccles. Gall.—vid. Hallier, p. 116.]

[s] In offic. sab. Pasch. post orat. quæ dicitur 'Data confirm.' [In biblioth. vett. patr., tom. viii. p. 434.]

take heed that the rite of confirmation be not neglected, because in that every true baptism is ratified and confirmed.' Which words are also to the same purpose made use of by Albinus Flaccus[t]. No man can tell to what degrees of diligence and labour, to what sufferings or journeyings he is obliged for the procuring of this ministry: there must be *debita sollicitudo;* a real providential zealous care to be where it is to be had, is the duty of every christian according to his own circumstances; but they who will not receive it unless it be brought to their doors, may live in such places and in such times where they shall be sure to miss it and pay the price of their neglect of so great a ministry of salvation. *Turpissima est jactura quæ per negligentiam fit*[u], 'he is a fool that loses his good by carelessness:' but no man is zealous for his soul, but he who not only omits no opportunity of doing it advantage when it is ready for him, but makes and seeks and contrives opportunities. *Si non necessitate, sed incuria et voluntate remanserit,* as S. Clement's expression is; if a man wants it by necessity, it may by the overflowings of the divine grace be supplied, but not so if negligence or choice causes the omission.

3. Our way being made plain, we may proceed to other places of scripture to prove the divine original of confirmation. It was a plant of our heavenly Father's planting, it was a branch of the vine, and how it springs from the root Christ Jesus we have seen; it is yet more visible as it was dressed and cultivated by the apostles. Now as soon as the apostles had received the Holy Spirit, they preached and baptized, and the inferior ministers did the same, and S. Philip particularly did so at Samaria, the converts of which place received all the fruits of baptism; but christians though they were, they wanted a τελείωσις, something to make them perfect. The other part of the narrative I shall set down in the words of S. Luke[x]: "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John; who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet He was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." If it had not been necessary to have added a new solemnity and ministration, it is not to be supposed the apostles Peter and John would have gone from Jerusalem to impose hands on the baptized at Samaria. *Id quod deerat a Petro et Joanne factum est, ut oratione pro eis habita et manu imposita, invocaretur et infunderetur super eos Spiritus Sanctus,* said S. Cyprian[y]; it was not necessary that they should be baptized again, only 'that which was wanting was performed by Peter

[t] [al. Alcuinus.] De offic. divin. in sabb. S. Pasch. [col. 1064 A.]

[u] Seneca. [so Hallier, p. 177.]

[x] [Acts viii 14—17.]

[y] Ad Jubaian. [ep. lxxiii. p. 202.]

and John, that by prayer and imposition of hands the Holy Ghost should be invocated and poured upon them.' The same also is from this place affirmed by P. Innocentius the first[z], S. Hierome, and many others: and in the Acts of the apostles we find another instance of the celebration of this ritual and mystery, for it is signally expressed of the baptized Christians at Ephesus, that S. Paul first baptized them, and then laid his hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And these testimonies are the great warranty for this holy rite. *Quod nunc in confirmandis neophytis manus impositio tribuit singulis, hoc tunc Spiritus Sancti descensio in credentium populo donavit universis,* said Eucherius[a] Lugdunensis, in his homily of Pentecost: the same thing that is done now in imposition of hands on single persons, is no other than that which was done upon all believers in the descent of the Holy Ghost; it is the same ministry, and all deriving from the same authority.

Confirmation or imposition of hands for the collation of the Holy Spirit we see was actually practised by the apostles, and that even before and after they preached the gospel to the gentiles; and therefore Amalarius[b], who entered not much into the secret of it, reckons this ritual as derived from the apostles *per consuetudinem,* 'by catholic custom;' which although it is not perfectly spoken as to the whole *αὐθεντία* or authority of it, yet he places it in the apostles, and is a witness of the catholic succeeding custom and practice of the church of God. Which thing also Zanchius observing, though he followed the sentiment of Amalarius, and seemed to understand no more of it, yet says well, *Interim* (says he) *exempla apostolorum et veteris ecclesiæ vellem pluris æstimari,* 'I wish that the example of the apostles and the primitive church were of more value amongst Christians.' It were very well indeed they were so, but there is more in it than mere example. These examples of such solemnities productive of such spiritual effects are, as S. Cyprian calls them, *apostolica magisteria,* the apostles are our masters in them, and have given rules and precedents for the church to follow. This is a christian law, and written as all scriptures are, for our instruction. But this I shall expressly prove in the next paragraph.

4. We have seen the original from Christ, the practice and exercise of it in the apostles and the first converts in christianity; that which I shall now remark is, that this is established and passed into a christian doctrine. The warranty for what I say is the words of S. Paul[c], where the holy rite of confirmation, so called from the effect of this ministration, and expressed by the ritual part of it, imposition of hands, is reckoned a fundamental point, *θεμέλιος ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν·* "Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and

[z] Epist. i. c. 3. adv. Luciferian. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 294.]
[a] [Sive Eusebius Lugd.—Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. v. part. 1. p. 572 A.]
[b] [lib. i. c. 27. p. 324 B.]
[c] [Heb. vi. 1, 2.]

of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, of resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment." Here are six fundamental points of S. Paul's catechism, which he laid as the foundation or the beginning of the institution of the christian church; and among these imposition of hands is reckoned as a part of the foundation, and therefore they who deny it dig up foundations. Now that this imposition of hands is that which the apostles used in confirming the baptized, and invocating the Holy Ghost upon them, remains to be proved.

For it is true that imposition of hands signifies all christian rites except baptism and the Lord's supper; not the sacraments, but all the sacramentals of the church: it signifies confirmation, ordination, absolution, visitation of the sick, blessing single persons (as Christ did the children brought to Him) and blessing marriages; all these were usually ministered by imposition of hands. Now the three last are not pretended to be any part of this foundation; neither reason, authority, nor the nature of the thing suffer any such pretension: the question then is between the first three.

First, absolution of penitents cannot be meant here, not only because we never read that the apostles did use that ceremony in their absolutions; but because the apostle speaking of the foundation in which baptism is, and is reckoned one of the principal parts in the foundation, there needed no absolution but baptismal, for they and we believing 'one baptism for the remission of sins[d],' this is all the absolution that can be at first and in the foundation. The other was *secunda post naufragium tabula*, it came in after, when men had made a shipwreck of their good conscience, and were, as S. Peter[e] says, λήθην λαβόντες τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, 'forgetful of the former cleansing and purification and washing of their old sins.'

Secondly, it cannot be meant of ordination; and this is also evident, 1) Because the apostle says he would thenceforth leave to speak of the foundation, and go on to perfection, that is, to higher mysteries; now in rituals, of which he speaks, there is none higher than ordination. 2) The apostle, saying he would speak no more of imposition of hands, goes presently to discourse of the mysteriousness of the evangelical priesthood, and the honour of that vocation; by which it is evident he spake nothing of ordination in the catechism or narrative of fundamentals. 3) This also appears from the context, not only because laying on of hands is immediately set after baptism, but also because in the very next words of his discourse he does enumerate and apportion to baptism and confirmation their proper and proportioned effects: to baptism, 'illumination,' according to the perpetual style of the church of God, calling baptism φωτισμὸν, 'an enlightening;' and to confirmation he reckons 'tasting the heavenly gift,' and being made partakers of the Holy Ghost; by the

[d] Symbol. Nicæn. et C. P. [e] [2 Pet. i. 9.]

thing signified declaring the sign, and by the mystery the rite. Up these words S. Chrysostom[f] discoursing, says that "all these a fundamental articles; that is, that we ought to repent from de works, to be baptized into the faith of Christ, and be made wort of the gift of the Spirit, who is given by imposition of hands, and are to be taught the mysteries of the resurrection and eternal jud ment." This catechism (says he) is perfect: so that if any man ha faith in God, and being baptized is also confirmed, and so tastes t heavenly gift and partakes of the Holy Ghost, and by hope of t resurrection tastes of the good things of the world to come, if falls away from this state, and turns apostate from this whole d pensation, digging down and turning up these foundations, he sh never be built again; he can never be baptized again, and never confirmed any more; God will not begin again, and go over wi him again, he cannot be made a Christian twice: if he remains up these foundations, though he sins he may be renewed *διὰ μετάνοιc* 'by repentance,' and by a resuscitation of the Spirit, if he have n wholly quenched Him; but if he renounces the whole covenant, d own and cancel these foundations, he is desperate, he can never renewed *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, 'to the title and economy of repentanc This is the full explication of this excellent place, and any oth ways it cannot reasonably be explicated: but therefore into tl place any notice of ordination cannot come, no sense, no myste can be made of it or drawn from it; but by the interposition of co firmation the whole context is clear, rational, and intelligible.

This then is that imposition of hands of which the apostle speak *Unus hic locus abunde testatur, &c.*, saith Calvin[g], 'this one pla doth abundantly witness' that the original of this rite or ceremony w from the apostles; *οὕτω γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάμβανον*, saith S. Chr sostom[h], for by this rite of imposition of hands they received the Ho Ghost. For though the Spirit of God was given extra-regularl and at all times, as God was pleased to do great things; yet th imposition of hands was *διακονία πνεύματος*, this was 'the minist of the Spirit.' For so we receive Christ when we hear and obey H word, we eat Christ by faith, and we live by His spirit; and y the blessed eucharist is *διακονία σώματος καὶ αἵματος*, 'the minist of the body and blood of Christ.' Now as the Lord's supper appointed ritually to convey Christ's body and blood to us; so confirmation ordained ritually to give unto us the Spirit of Go And though by accident and by the overflowings of the Spirit it ma come to pass that a man does receive perfective graces alone, an without ministries external: yet such a man without a miracle is n a perfect Christian *ex statuum vitæ dispositione*; but in the ordina ways and appointment of God, and until he receive this impositio

[f] [In Hebr. vi. hom. ix. tom. xii. p. 93.]

[g] [In Heb. vi. 2.]

[h] In hunc locum. [hom. ix. tom. x p. 95 C.]

of hands, and be confirmed, is to be accounted an imperfect Christian. But of this afterwards.

I shall observe one thing more out of this testimony of S. Paul. He calls it the doctrine of baptisms and laying on of hands: by which it does not only appear to be a lasting ministry, because no part of the christian doctrine could change or be abolished; but hence also it appears to be of divine institution. For if it were not, S. Paul had been guilty of that which our blessed Saviour reproves in the scribes and pharisees, and should have taught for doctrines the commandments of men. Which because it cannot be supposed, it must follow that this doctrine of confirmation or imposition of hands is apostolical and divine. The argument is clear and not easy to be reproved.

§ 2. The rite of confirmation is a perpetual and never-ceasing ministry.

YEA, but what is this to us? It belonged to the days of wonder and extraordinary; the Holy Ghost breathed upon the apostles and apostolical men, but then He breathed His last; *recedente gratia recessit disciplina*, 'when the grace departed we had no further use of the ceremony.'—In answer to this I shall ψιλαῖς ἐπινοίαις, by divers particulars evince plainly, that this ministry of confirmation was not temporary and relative only to the acts of the apostles, but was to descend to the church for ever. This indeed is done already in the preceding section, in which it is clearly manifested that Christ himself [i] made the baptism of the Spirit to be necessary to the church. He declared the fruits of this baptism, and did particularly relate it to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the church at and after that glorious Pentecost. He sanctified it and commended it by His example; just as in order to baptism He sanctified the flood Jordan, and all other waters, to the mystical washing away of sin, viz., by His great example, and fulfilling this righteousness also. This doctrine the apostles first found in their own persons and experience, and practised to all their converts after baptism by a solemn and external rite; and all this passed into an evangelical doctrine, the whole mystery being signified by the external rite in the words of the apostle, as before it was by Christ expressing only the internal; so that there needs no more strength to this argument.

But that there may be wanting no moments to this truth which the holy scripture affords, I shall add more weight to it: and,

1. The perpetuity of this holy rite appears, because this great gift of the Holy Ghost was promised to abide with the church for ever. And when the Jews heard the apostles speak with tongues at the first and miraculous descent of the Spirit in Pentecost, to take off the strangeness of the wonder and the envy of the power, S. Peter [k] at that very time tells them plainly, "Repent and be baptized every one of you,.. and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," ἕκαστος

[i] [John iii. 5.] [k] [Acts ii. 38.]

ὑμῶν· not the meanest person amongst you all but shall receive this great thing which ye observe us to have received; and not only you but your children too; not your children of this generation only,

Sed nati natorum, et qui nascentur ab illis,

but your children for ever: "For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call[l]." Now then let it be considered,

1) This gift is by promise; by a promise not made to the apostles alone, but to all; to all for ever.

2) Consider here at the very first, as there is a *verbum*, a word of promise, so there is *sacramentum* too (I use the word, as I have already premonished, in a large sense only, and according to the style of the primitive church:) it is a rite partly moral, partly ceremonial; the first is prayer, and the other is laying on of the hands: and to an effect that is but transient and extraordinary and of a little abode, it is not easy to be supposed that such a solemnity should be appointed. I say such a solemnity; that is, it is not imaginable that a solemn rite annexed to a perpetual promise should be transient and temporary, for by the nature of relatives they must be of equal abode. The promise is of a thing for ever; the ceremony or rite was annexed to the promise, and therefore this also must be for ever.

3) This is attested by S. Paul[m], who reduces this argument to this mystery, saying, "In whom after that ye believed, *signati estis Spiritu sancto promissionis*, ye were sealed by that holy Spirit of promise." He spake it to the Ephesians, who well understood his meaning by remembering what was done to themselves by the apostles[n] but a while before, who after they had baptized them did lay their hands upon them, and so they were sealed, and so they received the holy Spirit of promise; for here the very matter of fact is the clearest commentary on S. Paul's words: the Spirit which was promised to all Christians they then received when they were consigned, or had the ritual seal of confirmation by imposition of hands. One thing I shall remark here, and that is, that this and some other words of scripture relating to the sacraments or other rituals of religion do principally mean the internal grace, and our consignation is by a secret power, and the work is within; but it does not therefore follow that the external rite is not also intended: for the rite is so wholly for the mystery, and the outward for the inward, and yet by the outward God so usually and regularly gives the inward, that as no man is to rely upon the external ministry as if the *opus operatum* would do the whole duty, so no man is to neglect the external because the internal is the more principal. The mistake in this particular hath caused great contempt of the sacraments and rituals

[l] [ver. 39.] [m] [Eph. i. 13.] [n] [Acts xix. 6.]

of the church, and is the ground of the Socinian errors in these questions. But,

4) What hinders any man from a quick consent at the first representation of these plain reasonings and authorities? Is it because there were extraordinary effects accompanying this ministration, and because now there are not, that we will suppose the whole economy must cease? If this be it, and indeed this is all that can be supposed in opposition to it, it is infinitely vain.

1) Because these extraordinary effects did continue even after the death of all the apostles. S. Irenæus[o] says they did continue even to his time, even the greatest instance of miraculous power; *Et in fraternitate sæpissime propter aliquid necessarium, ea quæ est in quoquo loco universa ecclesia postulante per jejunium et supplicationem multam, reversus est spiritus, &c.*, 'when God saw it necessary, and the church prayed and fasted much, they did miraculous things, even of reducing the spirit to a dead man.'

2) In the days of the apostles the Holy Spirit did produce miraculous effects, but neither always, nor at all in all men: "are all workers of miracles? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? can all heal[p]?" No, the Spirit bloweth where He listeth, and as He listeth; He gives gifts to all, but to some after this manner and to some after that.

3) These gifts were not necessary at all times any more than to all persons; but the promise did belong to all, and was made to all, and was performed to all. In the days of the apostles there was an effusion of the Spirit of God, it ran over, it was for themselves and others, it wet the very ground they trod upon, and made it fruitful; but it was not to all in like manner, but there was also then, and since then, a diffusion of the Spirit, *tanquam in pleno*. S. Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost, he was full of faith and power[q]: the Holy Ghost was given to him to fulfil his faith principally, the working miracles was but collateral and incident. But there is also an infusion of the Holy Ghost, and that is to all, and that is for ever: "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal[r]," saith the apostle. And therefore if the grace be given to all, there is no reason that the ritual ministration of that grace should cease, upon pretence that the Spirit is not given extraordinarily.

4) These extraordinary gifts were indeed at first necessary. "In the beginnings always appear the sensible visions of spiritual things for their sakes who cannot receive the understanding of an incorporeal nature, that if afterward they be not so done they may be believed by those things which were already done," said S. Chrysostom[s] in the place before quoted; that is, these visible appearances were given at first by reason of the imperfection of the state

[o] Lib. ii. cap. 57. [al. 31. p. 164.]
[p] [1 Cor. xii. 29.]
[q] [Acts vi. 8.]
[r] [1 Cor. xii. 7.]
[s] In Matthæum. [p. 621, supra.]

of the church, but the greater gifts were to abide for ever: and therefore it is observable that S. Paul says that the gift of tongues is one of the least and most useless things; a mere sign, and not so much as a sign to believers, but to infidels and unbelievers; and before this he greatly prefers the gift of prophesying or preaching, which yet all Christians know does abide with the church for ever.

5) To every ordinary and perpetual ministry at first there were extraordinary effects and miraculous consignations. We find great parts of nations converted at one sermon. Three thousand converts came in at once preaching of S. Peter, and five thousand at another sermon: and persons were miraculously cured by the prayer of the bishop in his visitation of a sick Christian; and devils cast out in the conversion of a sinner; and blindness cured at the baptism of S. Paul; and Æneas was healed of a palsy at the same time he was cured of his infidelity; and Eutychus was restored to life at the preaching of S. Paul. And yet that now we see no such extraordinaries, it follows not that the visitation of the sick, and preaching sermons, and absolving penitents are not ordinary and perpetual ministrations: and therefore to fancy that invocation of the Holy Spirit and imposition of hands is to cease when the extraordinary and temporary contingencies of it are gone, is too trifling a fancy to be put in balance against so sacred an institution relying upon so many scriptures.

6) With this objection some vain persons would have troubled the church in S. Austin's time; but he considered it with much indignation, writing against the Donatists. His words are these[t], "At the first times the Holy Spirit fell upon the believers, and they spake with tongues which they had not learned, according as the Spirit gave them utterance. They were signs fitted for the season; for so the Holy Ghost ought to have signified in all tongues, because the gospel of God was to run through all the nations and languages of the world: so it was signified, and so it passed through. But is it therefore expected that they upon whom there is imposition of hands that they might receive the Holy Ghost, that they should speak with tongues? or when we lay hands on infants, does every one of you attend to hear them speak with tongues, and when he sees that they do not speak with tongues is any of you of so perverse a heart as to say they have not received the Holy Ghost, for if they had received Him they would speak with tongues as it was done at first? But if by these miracles there is not now given any testimony of the presence of the Holy Spirit, how doth any one know that he hath received the Holy Ghost?" *Interroget cor suum si diligit fratrem, manet Spiritus Dei in illo.* It is true the gift of tongues doth not remain, but all the greater gifts of the Holy Spirit remain with the church for ever; sanctification and power,

[t] Tract. vi. in [epist.] canonicam Joan. circa med. [§ 10. tom. iii. part. 2. col. 868.] et lib. iii. [de Bapt.] contr. Donat. c. 6. [leg. 16. tom. ix. col. 116 F.]

fortitude and hope, faith and love. Let every man search his heart, and see if he belongs to God; whether the love of God be not spread in his heart by the Spirit of God: let him see if he be not patient in troubles, comforted in his afflictions, bold to confess the faith of Christ crucified, zealous of good works. These are the miracles of grace, and the mighty powers of the Spirit, according to that saying of Christ[u], "These signs shall follow them that believe; in My name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall tread on serpents, they shall drink poison and it shall not hurt them, and they shall lay their hands on the sick and they shall recover." That which we call the miraculous part is the less power; but to cast out the devil of lust, to throw down the pride of Lucifer, to tread on the great dragon, and to triumph over our spiritual enemies, to cure a diseased soul, to be unharmed by the poison of temptation, of evil examples and evil company: these are the true signs that shall follow them that truly and rightly believe on the name of the Lord Jesus; this is to live in the Spirit, and to walk in the Spirit; this is more than to receive the Spirit to a power of miracles and supernatural products in a natural matter: for this is from a supernatural principle to receive supernatural aids to a supernatural end in the diviner spirit of a man; and this being more miraculous than the other, it ought not to be pretended that the discontinuance of extraordinary miracles should cause the discontinuance of an ordinary ministration; and this is that which I was to prove.

7) To which it is not amiss to add this observation, that Simon Magus offered to buy this power of the apostles, that he also by laying on of hands might thus minister the Spirit. Now he began this sin in the christian church, and it is too frequent at this day: but if all this power be gone, then nothing of that sin can remain; if the subject matter be removed, then the appendent crime cannot abide, and there can be no simony, so much as by participation; and whatever is or can be done in this kind, is no more of this crime than drunkenness is of adultery; it relates to it, or may be introductive of it, or be something like it. But certainly since the church is not so happy as to be entirely free from the crime of simony, it will be hard to say that the power the buying of which was the principle of this sin, and therefore the rule of all the rest, should be removed, and the house stand without a foundation, the relative without the correspondent, the accessary without the principal, and the accident without the subject. This is impossible, and therefore it remains that still there abides in the church this power, that by imposition of the hands of fit persons the Holy Ghost is ministered. But this will be further cleared in the next section.

[u] [Mark xvi. 17.]

§ 8. The holy rite of imposition of hands for the giving the Holy Spirit, or confirmation, was actually continued and practised by all the succeeding ages of the purest and primitive church.

2. NEXT to the plain words of scripture, the traditive interpretation and practice of the church of God is the best argument in the world for rituals and mystical ministrations; for the tradition is universal, and all the way acknowledged to be derived from scripture. And although in rituals the tradition itself, if it be universal and primitive, as this is, were alone sufficient, and is so esteemed in the baptism of infants, in the priests consecrating the holy eucharist, in public liturgies, in absolution of penitents, the Lord's day, communicating of women, and the like; yet this rite of confirmation being all that, and evidently derived from the practice apostolical, and so often recorded in the New testament, both in the ritual and mysterious part, both in the ceremony and spiritual effect, is a point of as great certainty as it is of usefulness and holy designation.

A. D. 170. Theophilus Antiochenus[x] lived not long after the death of S. John, and he derives the name of Christian, which was first given to the disciples in his city, from this chrism or spiritual unction, this confirmation of baptized persons; ἡμεῖς τούτου εἵνεκεν καλούμεθα Χριστιανοὶ ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ, 'we are therefore called Christians because we are anointed with the unction of God.' These words will be best understood by the subsequent testimonies, by which it will appear that confirmation (for reasons hereafter mentioned) was for many ages called chrism or unction. But he adds the usefulness of it: "for who is there that enters into the world, or that enters into contention or athletic combats, but is anointed with oil?" By which words he intimates the unction anciently used in baptism and in confirmation both; for in the first we have our new birth, in the second we are prepared for spiritual combat.

A. D. 200. Tertullian[y] having spoken of the rites of baptism, proceeds, *Dehinc* (saith he) *manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum sanctum; tunc ille sanctissimus Spiritus super emundata et benedicta corpora libens a Patre descendit;* 'after baptism the hand is imposed, by blessing calling and inviting the Holy Spirit; then that most Holy Spirit willingly descends from the Father upon the bodies that are cleansed and blessed,' that is, first baptized, then confirmed. And again[z], *Caro signatur ut anima muniatur; caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut anima Spiritu illuminetur;* 'the flesh is consigned or sealed (that also is one of the known primitive words for confirmation) that the soul may be guarded or defended; and the body is overshadowed by the imposition of hands, that the soul may be enlightened by the Holy Ghost.' Nay further yet, if any man objects that baptism is sufficient, he answers[a], It is true it is sufficient to them that are to die presently,

[x] [Ad Autolyc., lib. i. cap. 12. al. 17.]
[y] De baptismo, c. 8. [p. 226.]
[z] De resur. carn. cap. viii. [p. 330 C.]
[a] Ubi supra [not. y.] De bapt.

but it is not enough for them that are still to live and to fight against their spiritual enemies: for "in baptism we do not receive the Holy Ghost" (for although the apostles had been baptized, yet the Holy Ghost was come upon none of them until Jesus was glorified) *sed in aqua emundati, sub angelo Spiritui sancto præparamur,* 'but being cleansed by baptismal water, we are disposed for the Holy Spirit under the hand of the angel' of the church, under the bishop's hand. And a little after he expostulates the article, *Non licebit Deo in suo organo per manus sanctas sublimitatem modulari spiritalem,* 'is it not lawful for God, by an instrument of His own under holy hands to accord the heights and sublimity of the Spirit?' For indeed this is the divine order; and therefore Tertullian[b] reckoning the happiness and excellency of the church of Rome at that time, says, "She believes in God, she signs with water, she clothes with the Spirit" (viz. in confirmation) "she feeds with the eucharist, she exhorts to martyrdom; and against this order or institution she receives no man."

A. D. 250. S. Cyprian[c], in his epistle to Jubaianus, having urged that of the apostles going to Samaria to impose hands on those whom S. Philip had baptized, adds, *Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur, per præpositos*[d] *ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, et signaculo dominico consummentur;* 'which custom is also descended to us, that they who are baptized might be brought by the rulers of the church, and by our prayer and the imposition of hands,' said the martyr bishop, 'may obtain the Holy Ghost, and be consummated with the Lord's signature.' And again[e], *Ungi necesse est eum qui baptizatus est, &c. Et super eos qui in ecclesia baptizati erant, et ecclesiasticum et legitimum baptismum consecuti fuerant, oratione pro iis habita, et manu imposita, invocaretur et infunderetur Spiritus sanctus;* 'it is necessary that every one who is baptized should receive the unction, that he may be Christ's anointed one, and may have in him the grace of Christ;'... 'they who have received lawful and ecclesiastical baptism, it is not necessary they should be baptized again; but that which is wanting must be supplied, viz., that prayer being made for them, and hands imposed, the Holy Ghost be invocated and poured upon them.'

A. D. 200. S. Clement of Alexandria[f], a man of venerable antiquity and admirable learning, tells that a certain young man was by S. John delivered to the care of a bishop, who having baptized him, *postea vero sigillo domini, tanquam perfecta tutaque ejus custodia*[g]*, eum obsignavit,* 'afterwards he sealed him with the Lord's signature' (the church word for confirmation) 'as with a safe and perfect guard.'

[b] De præscript., cap. xxxvi. [p. 215 B.]
[c] Epist. lxxiii. [p. 202.]
[d] [al. præpositis.]
[e] Epist. lxx. [p. 190.] et lxxiii. [vid. p. 202.]
[f] Apud Euseb., lib. iii. c. 17. [al. 23.]
[g] Τὸ τέλειον φυλακτήριον.

A. D. 210. Origen[h] in his seventh homily upon Ezekiel, expounding certain mystical words of the prophet, saith, *Oleum est quo vir sanctus ungitur, oleum Christi, oleum sanctæ doctrinæ: cum ergo accepit aliquis hoc oleum quo ungitur sanctus, id est, scripturam sanctam instituentem quomodo oporteat baptizari in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, et pauca commutans unxerit quempiam, et quodammodo dixerit, Jam non es catechumenus, consecutus es lavacrum secundæ generationis; talis homo accipit oleum Dei, &c.;* 'the unction of Christ, of holy doctrine, is the oil by which the holy man is anointed, having been instructed in the scriptures, and taught how to be baptized; then changing a few things he says to him, Now you are no longer a catechumen, now you are regenerated in baptism: such a man receives the unction of God,' viz. he then is to be confirmed.

S. Dionys, commonly called the Areopagite, in his excellent book of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy[i], speaks most fully of the holy rite of confirmation or chrism. Having described at large the office and manner of baptizing the catechumens, the trine immersion, the vesting them in white garments, he adds, "Then they bring them again to the bishop, and he consigns him" who had been so baptized θεουργικωτάτῳ μύρῳ, 'with the most divinely operating unction,' and then gives him the most holy eucharist. And afterwards[k] he says, "But even to him who is consecrated in the most holy mystery of regeneration, τοῦ μύρου τελειωτικὴ χρίσις, the perfective unction of chrism gives to him the advent of the Holy Spirit." And this rite of confirmation, then called chrism, from the spiritual unction then effected, and consigned also and signified by the ceremony of anointing externally, which was then the ceremony of the church, he calls it τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς θεογενεσίας τελείωσιν, 'the holy consummation of our baptismal regeneration;' meaning that without this there is something wanting to the baptized persons.

A. D. 260. And this appears fully in that famous censure of Novatus by Cornelius bishop of Rome, reported by Eusebius[l]. Novatus had been baptized in his bed, being very sick and like to die; "but when he recovered, he did not receive those other things which by the rule of the church he ought to have received, *neque Domini sigillo ab episcopo consignatus est*, he was not consigned with the Lord's signature by the hands of the bishop," he was not confirmed; *quo non impetrato, quomodo Spiritum sanctum obtinuisse putandus est*, 'which having not obtained, how can he be supposed to have received the Holy Spirit?' The same also is something more fully related by Nicephorus[m], but wholly to the same purpose.

[h] [tom. iii. p. 383.]
[i] De eccles. hier., c. ii. [p. 79.]
[k] Cap. iv. [p. 116.]
[l] Lib. vi. hist. eccles. [c. 43.]
[m] Lib. vi. cap. 3. [tom. i. p. 391.]

A. D. 320. Melchiades[n], in his epistle to the bishops of Spain, argues excellently about the necessity and usefulness of the holy rite of confirmation. "What does the mystery of confirmation profit me after the mystery of baptism? certainly we did not receive all in our baptism, if after that lavatory we want something of another kind. Let your charity attend. As the military order requires that when the general enters a soldier into his list he does not only mark him but furnishes him with arms for the battle: so in him that is baptized this blessing is his ammunition. You have given (Christ) a soldier, give him also weapons. And what will it profit him if a father gives a great estate to his son if he does not care to provide a tutor for him? Therefore the Holy Spirit is the guardian of our regeneration in Christ, He is the comforter, and He is the defender."

A. D. 370. I have already alleged the plain testimonies of Optatus and S. Cyril[o] in the first section. I add to them the words of S. Gregory Nazianzen[p] speaking of confirmation or the christian signature; *Hoc et viventi tibi maximum est tutamentum; ovis enim quæ sigillo insignita est non facile patet insidiis, quæ vero signata non est facile a furibus capitur;* 'this signature is your greatest guard while you live; for a sheep when it is marked with the master's sign, is not so soon stolen by thieves, but easily if she be not.' The same manner of speaking is also used by S. Basil[q], who was himself together with Eubulus confirmed by bishop Maximinus; *Quomodo curam geret tanquam ad se pertinentis angelus, quomodo eripiat ex hostibus, si non agnoverit signaculum?* 'How shall the angel know what sheep belong unto his charge, how shall he snatch them from the enemy, if he does not see their mark and signature?' Theodoret also and Theophylact[r] speak the like words; and so far as I can perceive, these and the like sayings are most made use of by the school men to be their warranty for an indelible character imprinted in confirmation: I do not interest myself in the question, but only recite the doctrine of these fathers in behalf of the practice and usefulness of confirmation.

I shall not need to transcribe hither those clear testimonies[s] which are cited from the epistles of S. Clement, Urban the first, Fabianus, and Cornelius; the sum of them is in those plainest words of Urban the first[t], *Omnes fideles per manus impositionem episcoporum Spiritum sanctum post baptismum accipere debent,* 'all faithful people ought to receive the Holy Spirit by imposition of the bishop's hands after baptism.' Much more to the same purpose is to be read col-

[n] [concil. reg., tom. i. p. 698.]
[o] [p. 619 sq. supra.]
[p] Adhort. ad s. lavacrum. [orat. xl. cap. 15. tom. i. p. 701 C.]
[q] [Hom. xiii. tom. ii. p. 117 B.]
[r] [Ambo] In cap. i. [ver. 13.] ad Ephes.
[s] [cf. p. 31, supra.]
[t] [concil. reg., tom. i. p. 293.]

lected by Gratian[u] De consecrat. dist. 4, '*Presbyt.*'; et De consecrat. dist. 5, '*Omnes fideles,*' et ibid. '*Spiritus sanctus.*'

S. Hierome[x] brings in a Luciferian asking, why he that is baptized in the church does not receive the Holy Ghost but by imposition of the bishop's hands. The answer is, *hanc observationem ex scripturæ auctoritate ad sacerdotii honorem descendere,* 'this observation for the honour of the priesthood did descend from the authority of the scriptures;' adding withal, 'it was for the prevention of schisms, and that the safety of the church did depend upon it.' *Exigis ubi scriptum est?* 'If you ask where it is written,' it is answered, *in Actibus apostolorum,* it is written 'in the Acts of the apostles.' But if there were no authority of scripture for it, *totius orbis in hanc partem consensus instar præcepti obtineret,* 'the consent of the whole christian world in this article ought to prevail as a commandment.' But here is a twofold chord, scripture and universal tradition; or rather scripture expounded by an universal traditive interpretation. The same observation is made from scripture by S. Chrysostom[y]; the words are very like those now recited from S. Hierome's dialogue, and therefore need not be repeated.

S. Ambrose[z] calls confirmation *spiritale signaculum quod post fontem superest, ut perfectio fiat,* 'a spiritual seal remaining after baptism, that perfection be had.' Œcumenius[a] calls it τελειότητα, 'perfection.' *Lavacro peccata purgantur, chrismate Spiritus sanctus superfunditur; utraque vero ista manu et ore antistitis impetramus,* said Pacianus[b] bishop of Barcinona; 'in baptism our sins are cleansed, in confirmation the Holy Spirit is poured upon us; and both these we obtained by the hands and mouth of the bishop.' And again[c], *Vestræ plebi unde Spiritus, quam non consignat unctus sacerdos?* The same with that of Cornelius in the case of Novatus before cited.

I shall add no more, lest I overset the article and make it suspicious by too laborious a defence: only after these numerous testimonies of the fathers I think it may be useful to represent that this holy rite of confirmation hath been decreed by many councils.

The council of Eliberis[d], celebrated in the time of P. Sylvester the first, decreed that whosoever is baptized in his sickness, if he recover, *ad episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit,* 'let him be brought to the bishop, that he may be perfected by the imposition of hands.' To the same purpose is the 77th

[u] [coll. 2203, 21.]
[x] Dial. adv. Lucifer. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 294.]
[y] Homil. xviii. in Act. [tom. ix. p. 146 D.]
[z] Lib. iii. De sacram. c. 2. [tom. ii. col. 363 E.]
[a] In Hebr. vi. [vid. in ver. 2.]
[b] [De bapt.—Magn. bibl. vett. patr., tom. iv. p. 247.]
[c] Lib. iii. cont. Novat. [ibid. p. 239 C.]
[d] Can. 38. [tom. i. col. 254.]

canon[d], *Episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit,* 'the bishop must perfect those' whom the minister baptized, 'by his benediction.'

The council of Laodicea[e] decreed ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς φωτιζομένους μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα χρίεσθαι χρίσματι ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μετόχους εἶναι τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'all that are baptized must be anointed with the celestial unction, and [so] be partakers of the kingdom of Christ.' All that are so (that is, are confirmed, for this celestial unction is done "by holy prayers and the invocation of the Holy Spirit," so Zonaras[f] upon this canon; all such who have this unction) shall reign with Christ, unless by their wickedness they preclude their own possessions. This canon was put into the code of the catholic church, and makes the 152nd canon.

The council of Orleans[g] affirms expressly that he who is baptized cannot be a Christian (meaning according to the usual style of the church, a full and perfect Christian) *nisi confirmatione episcopali fuerit chrismatus,* 'unless he have the unction of episcopal confirmation.'

But when the church had long disputed concerning the re-baptizing of heretics, and made canons for and against it according as the heresies were, and all agreed that if the first baptism had been once good it could never be repeated; yet they thought it fit that such persons should be confirmed by the bishop, all supposing confirmation to be the perfection and consummation of the less perfect baptism. Thus the first council of Arles[h] decreed concerning the Arians, that if they had been baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they should not be re-baptized, *Manus tantum eis imponatur ut accipiant Spiritum sanctum;* that is, 'let them be confirmed, let there be imposition of hands that they may receive the Holy Ghost. The same is decreed by the second council of Arles[i] in the case of the Bonosiaci. But I also find it in a greater record, in the general council of Constantinople[j], where heretics are commanded upon their conversion to be received *secundum constitutum officium.* There was an office appointed for it, and it is in the Greeks' *Euchologion*[k]*; Sigillatos, primo scil. unctos unguento chrismatis, &c. —Et signantes eos dicimus, Sigillum doni Spiritus sancti.* It is the form of confirmation used to this day in the Greek church.

So many fathers testifying the practice of the church and teaching this doctrine, and so many more fathers as were assembled in six councils all giving witness to this holy rite, and that in pursuance also of scripture, are too great a cloud of witnesses to be despised by any man that calls himself a Christian.

[d] [col. 258.]
[e] [can. 48. tom. i. col. 789.]
[f] [Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 475.]
[g] Habetur apud Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. v. cap. 'Ut jejuni.' [sc. cap. vi. col. 2224.]
[h] Cap. 8. [tom. i. col. 265.]
[i] Can. 17. [tom. ii. col. 774.]
[j] Can 7. [tom. i. col. 812.]
[k] [Goar, p. 880.]

§ 4. The bishops were always, and the only ministers of confirmation.

SAINT Chrysostom[1] asking the reason why th maritans, who were baptized by Philip, coul from him and by his ministry receive the Holy G answers, "Perhaps this was done for the hono the apostles," to distinguish the supereminent di which they bore in the church from all inferior ministrations: bu answer not satisfying, he adds, *Hoc donum non habebat, erat en septem illis, id quod magis videtur dicendum: unde (mea sente hic Philippus unus ex septem erat, secundus a Stephano; id baptizans Spiritum sanctum non dabat, neque enim facultate bebat, hoc enim donum solorum apostolorum erat;* 'this gift the not who baptized the Samaritans, which thing is rather to be than the other: for Philip was one of the seven, and in my op next to S. Stephen; therefore though he baptized yet he gav the Holy Ghost, for he had no power so to do, for this gif proper only to the apostles.' *Nam virtutem quidem accep (diaconi) faciendi signa, non autem dandi aliis Spiritum sanc igitur hoc erat in apostolis singulare, unde et præcipuos, et non videmus hoc facere;* 'the ministers that baptized had a pow doing signs and working miracles, but not of giving the Holy S therefore this gift was peculiar to the apostles, whence it com pass that we see the chiefs[m] in the church, and no other, t this.

S. Dionys[n] says, χρεία τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἔσται, 'there is need bishop' to confirm the baptized, αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἀρχαία συνήθεια, this was the ancient custom' of the church. And this was wont done by the bishops for conservation of unity in the church of C said S. Ambrose[o]; *a solis episcopis,* 'by bishops only,' said S. Aus "for the bishops succeeded in the place and ordinary office o apostles," said S. Hierome[q]. And therefore in his dialogue ag the Luciferians[r] it is said that "this observation for the hono the priesthood did descend that the bishops only might by impos of hands confer the Holy Ghost; that it comes from scripture, it is written in the Acts of the apostles, that it is done for the vention of schisms, that the safety of the church depends upon i

But the words of P. Innocentius the first[s] in his first epistle and chapter, and published in the first tome of the councils, are ver to this particular. *De consignandis infantibus, manifestum est ab alio quam ab episcopo fieri licere; nam presbyteri, licet sint s dotes, pontificatus tamen apicem non habent: hæc autem pontifi solis deberi, ut vel consignent, vel Paracletum spiritum tradant,*

[1] Homil. xviii. in Acta. [tom. ix. p. 146 D.]
[m] τοὺς κορυφαίους.
[n] Cap. v. Eccles. hier. [leg. Pachymeres, in loc. cit.—vid. p. 123 supra.]
[o] In Hebr. vi. [? vid. p. 41, not. x, supra.]
[p] Qu. 44. in N. T. [leg. 42. tom. iii. append. col. 84.]
[q] [p. 41 supra.]
[r] [p. 642 not. x, supra.]
[s] [concil. reg., tom. i. p. 7.]

solum consuetudo ecclesiastica demonstrat, verum et illa lectio Actuum apostolorum, quæ asserit Petrum et Joannem esse directos qui jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum sanctum; 'concerning confirmation of infants, it is manifest it is not lawful to be done by any other than by the bishop; for although the presbyters be priests, yet they have not the summity of episcopacy; but that these things are only due to bishops is not only demonstrated by the custom of the church, but by that of the Acts of the apostles, where Peter and John were sent to minister the Holy Ghost to them that were baptized.' Optatus[s] proves Macarius to be no bishop, because he was not conversant in the episcopal office, and imposed hands on none that were baptized. *Hoc unum a majoribus fit, id est, a summis pontificibus, quod a minoribus perfici non potest,* said P. Melchiades[t], 'this (of confirmation) is only done by the greater ministers, that is, by the bishops, and cannot be done by the lesser.' This was the constant practice and doctrine of the primitive church, and derived from the practice and tradition of the apostles, and recorded in their acts written by S. Luke. For this is our great rule in this case, what they did in rituals and consigned to posterity is our example and our warranty: we see it done thus, and by these men, and by no others and no otherwise, and we have no other authority, and we have no reason to go another way. The ἄνδρες ἡγούμενοι in S. Luke, the κορυφαῖοι in S. Chrysostom, the πρόεδρος in Philo, and the πρεσβύτατος, the chief governor in ecclesiasticals, his office is τὰ μὴ γνώριμα ἐν τοῖς βίβλοις ἀναδιδάσκειν, 'to teach such things as are not set down in books;' their practice is a sermon, their example in these things must be our rule, or else we must walk irregularly, and have no rule but chance and humour, empire and usurpation; and therefore much rather when it is recorded in holy writ must this observation be esteemed sacred and inviolable.

But how if a bishop be not to be had or not ready? S. Ambrose[u] is pretended to have answered, *Apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus,* 'a presbyter may consign if the bishop be not present;' and Amalarius[x] affirms, *Sylvestrum papam, prævidentem quantum periculosum iter arriperet qui sine confirmatione maneret, quantum potuit subvenisse, et propter absentiam episcoporum, necessitate addidisse, ut a presbytero ungerentur;* 'that pope Sylvester, foreseeing how dangerous a journey he takes who abides without confirmation, brought remedy as far as he could, and commanded

[s] Contr. Parmen., lib. vii. [cap. 6.]

[t] Epist. ad Episc. Hispan. [cap. 2. p. 698.]

Voluit Deus dona illa admiranda non contingere baptizatis nisi per manus apostolorum, ut auctoritatem testibus suis conciliaret quam maximam; quod ipsum simul ad retinendam ecclesiæ unitatem pertinebat.—Grotius. [in Act. viii. 15.]

Videtur ergo fuisse peculiare apostolorum munus dare Spiritum sanctum. —Isidor. Clarius in viii. Actuum apostolorum. [fol. 449 b.]

[u] In Eph. iv. [ver. 12, tom. ii. append. col. 241 F.]

[x] De offic. eccles. [lib. i.] cap. 27.

that in the absence of bishops they should be anointed by the priest: and therefore it is by some supposed that *Factum valet, fieri non debuit,* 'the thing ought not to be done but in the proper and appointed way, but when it is done it is valid;' just as in the case of baptism by a layman or woman. Nay, though some canons say it is *actio irrita,* the act is null, yet for this there is a *salvo* pretended; for sometimes an action is said to be *irrita* in law, which yet nevertheless is of secret and permanent value, and ought not to be done again. Thus if a priest be promoted by simony, it is said[y], *sacerdos non est, sed inaniter tantum dicitur,* 'he is but vainly called a priest, for he is no priest.' So Sixtus the second[z] said that if a bishop ordain in another's diocese the ordination is void; and in the law[a] it is said that if a bishop be consecrated without his clergy and the congregation, the consecration is null; and yet these later and fiercer constitutions do not determine concerning the natural event of things, but of the legal and canonical approbation.

To these things I answer[b] that S. Ambrose his saying that in Egypt the presbyters consign in the bishop's absence, does not prove that they ever did confirm or impose hands on the baptized for the ministry of the Holy Spirit; because that very passage being related by S. Austin[c], the more general word of 'consign' is rendered by the plainer and more particular *consecrant,* 'they consecrate,' meaning the blessed eucharist; which was not permitted primitively to a simple priest to do in the bishop's absence without leave, only in Egypt it seems they had a general leave, and the bishop's absence was an interpretative consent. But besides this, *consignant* is best interpreted by the practice of the church, of which I shall presently give an account; they might in the absence of the bishop consign with oil upon the top of the head, but not in the forehead, much less impose hands, or confirm, or minister the Holy Spirit: for the case was this;—

It was very early in the church that to represent the grace which was ministered in confirmation, the unction from above, they used oil and balsam, and so constantly used this in their confirmations that from the ceremony it had the appellation; *sacramentum chrismatis* S. Austin[d] calls it; ἐν μύρῳ τελείωσις, so Dionysius[e]. Now because at the baptism of the adult Christians and (by imitation of that) of infants, confirmation and baptism were usually ministered at the same time; the unction was not only used to persons newly baptized, but another unction was added as a ceremony in baptism itself, and was

[y] [Decret. caus.] i. qu. 1. cap. 'Qui vult.' [leg. 'Quicumque studet.'] 1 et 2. [col. 533.]

[z] Epist. ii. de episc. ordin. [concil. reg., tom. i. p. 533.]

[a] [Decret.] c. i. qu. 2. [leg. 3.] c. 'Ex multis.' [col. 625.]—Clement. de elect. cap. 'In plerisque.' [ad calc. decret. Bonifac. col. 45.]

[b] [He might now have answered that the commentary is considered spurious. Taylor himself elsewhere speaks of the passage with suspicion; see p. 126 above.]

[c] Qu. V. et N. T. qu. 101. [tom. iii. append. col. 93.]

[d] Lib. ii. cont. liter. Petiliani, c. 104. [tom. ix. col. 293.]

[e] [p. 616 supra.]

used immediately before baptism; and the oil was put on the top of the head, and three times was the party signed. So it was then, as we find in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. But besides this unction with oil in baptismal preparations, and pouring oil into the baptismal water, we find another unction after the baptism was finished. "For they bring the baptized person again to the bishop," saith S. Dionys[e], "who signing the man with hallowed chrism, gives him the holy eucharist." This they called χρίσιν τελειωτικὴν, 'the perfective or consummating unction:' this was that which was used when the bishop confirmed the baptized person: "for to him who is initiated by the most holy initiation of the divine generation" (that is, "to him who hath been baptized," saith Pachymeres[f] the paraphrast of Dionysius) "the perfective unction of chrism gives the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is that which the Laodicean council[g] calls χρίεσθαι μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα, 'to be anointed after baptism.' Both these unctions were intimated by Theophilus Antiochenus[h], Τίς δὲ ἄνθρωπος εἰσελθὼν εἰς τόνδε τὸν βίον, ἢ ἀθλῶν, οὐ χρίεται ἐλαίῳ; 'every man that is born into the world, and every man that is a champion, is anointed with oil:' that to baptism, this alluding to confirmation.

Now this chrism was frequently ministered immediately after baptism, in the cities where the bishop was present; but in villages and little towns where the bishop was not present it could not be, but bishops were forced at their opportunities to go abroad and perfect what was wanting, as it was in the example of Peter and John to the Samaritans. *Non quidem abnuo hanc esse ecclesiarum consuetudinem, et ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati sunt, episcopus ad invocationem sancti Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat*[i]; 'it is the custom of the church, that when persons are in lesser cities baptized by priests and deacons, the bishop uses to travel far, that he may lay hands on them for the invocation of the Holy Spirit." But because this could not always be done, and because many baptized persons died before such an opportunity could be had; the church took up a custom, that the bishop should consecrate the chrism and send it to the villages and little cities distant from the metropolis, and that the priests should anoint the baptized with it. But still they kept this part of it sacred and peculiar to the bishop; first, that no chrism should be used but what the bishop consecrated; secondly, that the priests should anoint the head of the baptized, but at no hand the forehead, for that was still reserved for the bishop to do when he confirmed them. And this is evident in the epistle of P. Innocent[k] the first, above quoted. *Nam presbyteris, seu extra episcopum seu præsente episcopo baptizant, chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit con-*

[e] Eccles. hier., cap. 2. [p. 85.]
[f] [p. 54.—vid. p. 123 supra.]
[g] Can. 48. [tom. i. col. 789.]
[h] [vid. p. 638, not. x, supra.]
[i] S. Hieron. adv. Lucifer. ante med. [tom. iv. part. 2. col. 295.]
[k] [cap. 3.—Concil. reg., tom. i. p. 7.]

secratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradunt Spiritum paracletum. Now this the bishops did, not only to satisfy the desire of the baptized, but by this ceremony to excite the *votum confirmationis*, that they who could not actually be confirmed, might at least have it *in voto*, 'in desire,' and in ecclesiastical representation. This, as some think, was first introduced by pope Sylvester: and this is the consignation which the priests of Egypt used in the absence of the bishop; and this became afterward the practice in other churches.

But this was no part of the holy rite of confirmation, but a ceremony annexed to it ordinarily; from thence transmitted to baptism, first by imitation, afterwards by way of supply and in defect of the opportunities of confirmation episcopal. And therefore we find in the first Arausican council[l], in the time of Leo the first and Theodosius junior, it was decreed that in baptism every one should receive chrism; *De eo autem qui in baptismate, quacunque necessitate faciente, chrismatus non fuerit, in confirmatione sacerdos commonebitur,* 'if the baptized by any intervening accident or necessity was not anointed, the bishop should be advertised of it in confirmation;' meaning that then it must be done. For the chrism was but a ceremony annexed, no part of either rite essential to it; but yet they thought it necessary by reason of some opinions then prevailing in the church. But here the rites themselves are clearly distinguished; and this of confirmation was never permitted to mere presbyters. Innocentius the third[m], a great canonist and of great authority, gives a full evidence in this particular. *Per frontis chrismationem manus impositio designatur, .. quia*[n] *per eam Spiritus sanctus ad augmentum datur et robur; unde cum cæteras unctiones simplex sacerdos vel presbyter valeat exhibere, hanc non nisi summus sacerdos, id est, episcopus debet conferre;* 'by anointing of the forehead the imposition of hands is designed, because by that the Holy Ghost is given for increase and strength; therefore when a single priest may give the other unctions, yet this cannot be done but by the chief priest, that is, the bishop.' And therefore to the question what shall be done if a bishop may not be had? the same Innocentius answers, "It is safer and without danger wholly to omit it than to have it rashly and without authority ministered by any other, *cum umbra quædam ostendatur in opere, veritas autem non subeat in effectu,* for it is a mere shadow without truth or real effect when any one else does it but the person whom God hath appointed to this ministration." And no approved man of the church did ever say the contrary, till Richard primate of Ardmagh[o] commenced a new opinion, from whence (Thomas of Walden[p] says that) Wiclef borrowed his doctrine to trouble the church in this particular.

[l] [can. 2. tom. i. col. 1784.]

[m] [Decret. constit., lib. i. c. 83. tom. ii. p. 627.]

[n] [. . . 'designatur, quæ alio nomine dicitur confirmatio, quia' .. &c.] [p. 618, not. k, supra.]

[p] [De sacram. confirm.,—opp. tom. ii. fol. 187 b sqq.—fol. Venet. 1571.]

What the doctrine of the ancient church was in the purest times I have already (I hope) sufficiently declared; what it was afterwards when the ceremony of chrism was as much remarked as the rite to which it ministered, we find fully declared by Rabanus Maurus[q]. *Signatur baptizatus cum chrismate per sacerdotem in capitis summitate, per pontificem vero in fronte; ut priori unctione significetur Spiritus sancti super ipsum descensio ad habitationem Deo consecrandam; in secunda quoque, ut ejus Spiritus sancti septiformis gratia, cum omni plenitudine sanctitatis et scientiæ et virtutis, venire in hominem declaretur: tunc enim ipse Spiritus sanctus post mundata et benedicta corpora atque animas libens a Patre descendit, ut vas suum sua visitatione sanctificet et illustret; et nunc in hominem ad hoc venit, ut signaculum fidei quod in fronte suscepit, faciat eum donis cœlestibus repletum, et sua gratia confortatum, intrepide et audacter coram regibus et potestatibus hujus sæculi portare, ac nomen Christi libera voce prædicare;* 'in baptism the baptized was anointed on the top of the head, in confirmation on the forehead: by that was signified that the Holy Ghost was preparing a habitation for Himself; by this was declared the descent of the Holy Spirit, with His seven-fold gifts, with all fulness of knowledge and spiritual understanding.' These things were signified by the appendent ceremony; but the rites were ever distinguished, and did not only signify and declare but effect these graces by the ministry of prayer and imposition of hands.

The ceremony the church instituted and used as she pleased, and gave in what circumstances they would choose; and new propositions entered, and customs changed, and deputations were made, and the bishops in whom by Christ was placed the fulness of ecclesiastical power concredited to the priests and deacons so much as their occasions and necessities permitted: and because in those ages and places where the external ceremony was regarded (it may be) more than the inward mystery or the rite of divine appointment, they were apt to believe that the chrism or exterior unction delegated to the priests' ministry after the episcopal consecration of it, might supply the want of episcopal confirmation; it came to pass that new opinions were entertained, and the Regulars, the Friars and the Jesuits, who were always too little friends to the episcopal power, from which they would fain have been wholly exempted, publicly taught (in England especially) that chrism ministered by them with leave from the pope did do all that which ordinarily was to be done in episcopal confirmation. For as Tertullian complained in his time, *quibus fuit propositum aliter docendi, eos necessitas coegit aliter disponendi instrumenta doctrinæ;* 'they who had purposes of teaching new doctrines were constrained otherwise to dispose of the instruments and rituals appertaining to their doctrines.' These men, to serve ends, destroyed the article, and overthrew the ancient discipline and unity of the primi-

[q] De instit. cleric., lib. i. c. 30. [tom. vi. p. 10.]

tive church; but they were justly censured by the theological fa at Paris, and the censure well defended by Hallier, one of the dc of the Sorbon, whither I refer the reader that is curious in things.

But for the main; it was ever called *confirmatio episcopal impositio manuum episcoporum;* which our English word wel presses and perfectly retains the use; we know it by the cor name of 'bishopping' of children. I shall no further insist up only I shall observe that there is a vain distinction brought int schools and glosses of the canon law, of a minister ordinary and e ordinary; all allowing that the bishop is appointed the ord minister of confirmation, but they would fain innovate and pr that in some cases others may be ministers extraordinary. Thi vice is of infinite danger, to the destruction of the whole sacred of the ministry, and disparks the inclosures, and lays all in com and makes men supreme controllers of the orders of God, and upon a false principle, for in true divinity and by the econor the Spirit of God, there can be no minister of any divine ordi but he that is of divine appointment, there can be none bu ordinary minister. I do not say that God is tied to this way cannot be tied but by Himself: and therefore Christ gave a s commission to Ananias to baptize and to confirm S. Paul, an gave the Spirit to Cornelius even before he was baptized, an ordained S. Paul to be an apostle without the ministry of man. this I say, that though God can make ministers extraordinary, yet cannot, and they that go about to do so usurp the power of Christ snatch from His hand what He never intended to part with. apostles admitted others into a part of their care and of their p but when they intended to employ them in any ministry, they them so much of their order as would enable them; but a pers lower order could never be deputed minister of actions appropri the higher: which is the case of confirmation, by the practice tradition of the apostles and by the universal practice and do of the primitive catholic church, by which bishops only, the su sors of the apostles, were alone the ministers of confirmation: therefore if any man else usurp it, let them answer it; they do indeed to themselves, but no benefit to others, to whom they mi shadows instead of substances.

§ 5. The whole procedure or ritual of confirmation is by prayer and imposition of hands.

THE heart and the eye are lift up to God to blessings from Him, and so is the hand too; bu also falls upon the people and rests there to appl descending blessing to the proper and prepared cipient. God governed the people of Israel b hand of Moses and Aaron,

> —— et calidæ fecere silentia turbæ
> Majestate manus[p]:

[p] [Pers. sat. iv. 7.]

and both under Moses and under Christ, whenever the president of religion did bless the people, he lifted up his hand over the congregation; and when he blessed a single person he laid his hand upon him. This was the rite used by Jacob and the patriarchs, by kings and prophets, by all the eminently religious in the synagogue, and by Christ himself when He blessed the children which were brought to Him, and by the apostles when they blessed and confirmed the baptized converts; and whom else can the church follow? The apostles did so to the Christians of Samaria, to them of Ephesus; and S. Paul describes this whole mystery by the ritual part of it, calling it the foundation of the imposition of hands[q]. It is the solemnity of blessing, and the solemnity and application of paternal prayer. Τίνι γὰρ ἐπιτίθησι χεῖρα; τίνα δὲ εὐλογήσει; said Clement of Alexandria[r], 'Upon whom shall he lay his hands? whom shall he bless?' *Quid enim aliud est impositio manuum, nisi ὅratio super hominem?* said S. Austin[s], 'The bishop's laying his hands on the people, what is it but the solemnity of prayer for them?' that is, a prayer made by those sacred persons who by Christ are appointed to pray for them, and to bless in His name: and so indeed are all the ministries of the church, baptism, consecration of the B. eucharist, absolution, ordination, visitation of the sick; they are all *in genere orationis*, they are nothing but solemn and appointed prayer by an intrusted and a gracious person, specificated by a proper order to the end of the blessing then designed. And therefore when S. James commanded that the sick persons should send for the elders of the church, he adds, And let them 'pray over' them, that is, 'lay their hands on' the sick, and 'pray for' them; that is 'praying over' them: it is *adumbratio dextræ*, as Tertullian[t] calls it, the right hand of him that ministers over-shadows the person for whom the solemn prayer is to be made.

This is the office of the rulers of the church; for they in the divine eutaxy are made your superiors: they are indeed "your servants for Jesus' sake," but they are "over you in the Lord," and therefore are from the Lord appointed to bless the people; for "without contradiction," saith the apostle[u], "the less is blessed of the greater;" that is, God hath appointed the superiors in religion to be the great ministers of prayer, He hath made them the gracious persons, them He will hear, those He hath commanded to convey your needs to God, and God's blessings to you, and to ask a blessing is to desire them to pray for you; them, I say, "whom God most respecteth for their piety and zeal that way, or else regardeth for that their place and calling bindeth them above others to do this duty, such as are[v] natural and spiritual fathers[w]."

It is easy for profane persons to deride these things, as they do all religion which is not conveyed to them by sense or natural demon-

[q] [Heb. vi. 2.]
[r] Pædag., lib. iii. c. 11. [p. 291.]
[s] [De bapt. contr. Donat. iii. 16.]
[t] [vid. De resurrect. carn., c. viii.]
[u] [Heb. vii. 7.]
[v] [leg. 'as it doth.']
[w] Hooker, Eccl. pol., lib. v. [ch. 66.]

strations; but the economy of the Spirit and the things of God are spiritually discerned: "the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and no man knows whence it comes, and whither it goes;" and the operations are discerned by faith, and received by love and by obedience. *Date mihi christianum, et intelligit quod dico;* 'none but true Christians understand and feel these things.' But of this we are sure, that in all the times of Moses' law, while the synagogue was standing, and in all the days of christianity, so long as men loved religion and walked in the Spirit and minded the affairs of their souls, to have the prayers and the blessing of the fathers of the synagogue and the fathers of the church was esteemed no small part of their religion, and so they went to heaven. But that which I intend to say is this, that prayer and imposition of hands was the whole procedure in the christian rites; and because this ministry was most signally performed by this ceremony, and was also by S. Paul called and noted by the name of the ceremony, 'Imposition of hands,' this name was retained in the christian church, and this manner of ministering confirmation was all that was in the commandment or institution.

But because in confirmation we receive the unction from above, that is, then we are most signally 'made kings and priests unto God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices,' and to enable us to 'seek the kingdom of God and the righteousness of it,' and that the giving of the Holy Spirit is in scripture called the unction from above; the church of God in early ages made use of this allegory, and passed it into an external ceremony and representation of the mystery, to signify the inward grace.

> Post inscripta oleo frontis signacula, per quæ
> Unguentum regale datum est, et chrisma perenne[x];

'we are consigned on the forehead with oil, and a royal unction and an eternal chrism is given to us;' so Prudentius gives testimony of the ministry of confirmation in his time. A. D. 400.

Τοῦτο φυλάξατε ἄσπιλον, πάντων γάρ ἐστι[y] τοῦτο διδακτικὸν, καθὼς ἀρτίως ἠκούσατε τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου λέγοντος καὶ πολλὰ περὶ τούτου χρίσματος φιλοσοφοῦντος, said S. Cyril[z]; 'preserve this unction pure and spotless, for it teaches you all things, as you have heard the blessed S. John speaking and philosophizing many things of this holy chrism.' Upon this account the H. fathers used to bless and consecrate oil and balsam, that by an external signature they might signify the inward unction effected in confirmation: μύρον τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίας, τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον, 'this chrism is not simple or common when it is blessed, but the gift of Christ and the presence of His H. spirit, as it were effecting the divinity itself;' the body is indeed anointed with

[x] Prudent. in ψυχομαχίᾳ, lin. 361. [tom. ii. p. 619.]

[y] [leg. ἔσται.]

[z] Catech. [xxii.] mystag. iii. [cap. 7. p. 318 A.]

visible ointment, but is also sanctified by the holy and quickening Spirit: so S. Cyril[a]. I find in him and in some late synods[b] other pretty significations and allusions made by this ceremony of chrisms. *Nos autem pro igne visibili qui die pentecostes super apostolos apparuit, oleum sanctum, materiam nempe ignis, ex apostolorum traditione ad confirmandum adhibemus,* 'this using of oil was instead of the baptism with fire which Christ baptized His apostles with in Pentecost, and oil being the most proper matter of fire is therefore used in confirmation.'

That this was the ancient ceremony is without doubt, and that the church had power to do so hath no question; and I add, it was not unreasonable, for if ever the scripture expresses the mysteriousness of a grace conferred by an exterior ministry (as this is by imposition of hands) and represents it besides in the expression and analogy of any sensible thing, that expression drawn into a ceremony will not improperly signify the grace, since the Holy Ghost did choose that for His own expression and representment. In baptism we are said to be buried with Christ; the church does according to the analogy of that expression when she immerges the catechumen in the font, for then she represents the same thing which the Holy Ghost would have to be represented in that sacrament. The church did but the same thing when she used chrism in this ministration. This I speak in justification of that ancient practice; but because there was no command for it,—λόγος γεγραμμένος οὐκ ἔστι, said S. Basil[c], 'concerning chrism there is no written word,' that is, of the ceremony there is not, he said it not of the whole rite of confirmation, —therefore though to this we are all bound, yet as to the anointing the church is at liberty, and hath with sufficient authority omitted it in our ministrations.

In the liturgy of king Edward the sixth the bishops used the sign of the cross upon the foreheads of them that were to be confirmed. I do not find it since forbidden or revoked by any expression or intimation, saving only that it is omitted in our later offices; and therefore it may seem to be permitted to the discretion of the bishops, but yet not to be used unless where it may be for edification, and where it may be by the consent of the church, at least by interpretation; concerning which I have nothing else to interpose, but that neither this nor any thing else which is not of the nature and institution of the rite, ought to be done by private authority, nor ever at all but according to the apostle's rule, εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν· whatsoever is decent, and whatsoever is according to order, that is to be done, and nothing else: for prayer and imposition of hands for the invocating and giving the Holy Spirit is all that is in the foundation and institution.

[a] [Ibid., cap. 3. p. 317.]

[b] Synodus Bituricensis, apud Bochell., lib. i. [leg. ii.] decret. eccl. Gal. tit. 5. [cap. 10.]

[c] Lib. de Spir. S., cap. 17. [leg. 27. tom. iii. p. 55 A.]

§ 6. Many great graces and blessings are consequent to the worthy reception and due ministry of confirmation.

It is of itself enough, when it is fully understood, what is said in the Acts of the apostles at the first ministration of this rite, "they received the Holy Ghost;" that is, according to the expression of our blessed Saviour himself to the apostles when He commanded them in Jerusalem to expect the verification of His glorious promise, "they were endued with virtue from on high;" that is, with strength to perform their duty: which although it is not to be understood exclusively to the other rites and ministries of the church of divine appointment, yet it is properly and most signally true, and as it were in some sense appropriate to this. For as Aquinas[d] well discourses, the grace of Christ is not tied to the sacraments; but even this spiritual strength and virtue from on high can be had without confirmation, as without baptism remission of sins may be had: and yet we 'believe one baptism for the remission of sins,' and one confirmation for the obtaining this virtue from on high, this strength of the Spirit. But it is so appropriate to it by promise and peculiarity of ministration, that as without the desire of baptism our sins are not pardoned, so without at least the desire of confirmation we cannot receive this virtue from on high, which is appointed to descend in the ministry of the Spirit. It is true the ministry of the holy eucharist is greatly effective to this purpose; and therefore in the ages of martyrs the bishops were careful to give the people the holy communion frequently, *ut quos tutos esse contra adversarium volebant munimento dominicæ saturitatis armarent,* as S. Cyprian[e] with his colleagues wrote to Cornelius, 'that those whom they would have to be safe against the contentions of their adversaries, they should arm them with the guards and defences of the Lord's fulness.' But it is to be remembered that the Lord's supper is for the more perfect Christians, and it is for the increase of the graces received formerly, and therefore it is for remission of sins, and yet is no prejudice to the necessity of baptism, whose proper work is remission of sins; and therefore neither does it make confirmation unnecessary: for it renews the work of both the precedent rites, and repairs the breaches, and adds new energy, and proceeds in the same dispensations, and is renewed often, whereas the others are but once.

Excellent therefore are the words of John Gerson[f], the famous chancellor of Paris, to this purpose. "It may be said that in one way of speaking confirmation is necessary, and in another it is not. Confirmation is not necessary as baptism and repentance, for without these salvation cannot be had; this necessity is absolute. But there is a conditional necessity: thus if a man would not become weak it is necessary that he eat his meat well: and so confirmation is

[d] Part. iii. qu. 72. [art. 6. 'ad prim.']
[e] Epist. liv. [al. lvii. p. 117.]
[f] In opusc. aur. de Confirmat. [De septem sacramentis, art. De confirmatione, tom. ii. col. 78.]

necessary that the spiritual life and the health gotten in baptism may be preserved in strength against our spiritual enemies; for this is given for strength. Hence is that saying of Hugo de S. Victore, 'What does it profit that thou art raised up by baptism if thou art not able to stand by confirmation?' Not that baptism is not of value unto salvation without confirmation, but because he who is not confirmed will easily fall and too readily perish." The Spirit of God comes which way He pleases, but we are tied to use His own economy and expect the blessings appointed by His own ministries: and because to prayer is promised we shall receive whatever we ask, we may as well omit the receiving the holy eucharist, pretending that prayer alone will procure the blessings expected in the other, as well, I say, as omit confirmation, because we hope to be strengthened and receive virtue from on high by the use of the supper of the Lord. Let us use all the ministries of grace in their season; for "we know not which shall prosper, this or that, or whether they shall be both alike good[g]:" this only we know, that the ministries which God appoints are the proper seasons and opportunities of grace.

This power from on high, which is the proper blessing of confirmation, was expressed not only in speaking with tongues and doing miracles, for much of this they had before they received the Holy Ghost, but it was effected in spiritual and internal strengths; they were not only enabled for the service of the church, but were indued with courage and wisdom and christian fortitude and boldness to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and unity of heart and mind, singleness of heart, and joy in God. When it was for the edification of the church, miracles were done in confirmations; and S. Bernard[h], in the life of S. Malachias, tells that S. Malchus, bishop of Lismore in Ireland, confirmed a lunatic child, and at the same time cured him: but such things as these are extra-regular and contingent: this which we speak of is a regular ministry and must have a regular effect.

S. Austin[i] said that the Holy Spirit in confirmation was given *ad dilatanda ecclesiæ primordia*, 'for the propagating christianity in the beginnings of the church.' S. Hierome[j] says, it was *propter honorem sacerdotii*, 'for the honour of the priesthood.' S. Ambrose[k] says, it was *ad confirmationem unitatis in ecclesia Christi*, 'for the confirmation of unity in the church of Christ.' And they all say true; but the first was by the miraculous consignations which did accompany this ministry, and the other two were by reason that the mysteries were τὰ προτελεσθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, they were 'appropriated to the ministry of the bishop,' who is *caput unitatis*, the head, the last resort, the firmament of unity in the church. These effects

[g] [Eccles. xi. 6.]
[h] [col. 1932.]
[i] [De bapt. contra Donat., lib. iii. cap. 16. tom. ix. col. 116 F.]
[j] [vid. p. 124, not. k, supra.]
[k] [p. 644, not. o, supra.]

were regular indeed, but they were incident and accidental: are effects yet more proper and of greater excellency.

Now if we will understand in general what excellent frui consequent to this dispensation, we may best receive the not them from the fountain itself, our blessed Saviour. "He th lieves, out of his belly, as the scripture saith, shall flow riv living waters. But this He spake of the Spirit, which they th lieve on Him should receive[1]." This is evidently spoken of the which came down in Pentecost, which was promised to all should believe in Christ, and which the apostles ministered by sition of hands, the Holy Ghost himself being the expositor; can signify no less but that a spring of life should be put in heart of the confirmed, to water the plants of God; that they s become trees, not only planted by the water side (for so it w David's time and in all the ministry of the Old testament) but h a river of living water within them to make them fruitful of works, and bringing their fruit in due season, fruits worthy of a ment of life.

1. But the principal thing is this: confirmation is the co mation and perfection, the corroboration and strength of baptis baptismal grace; for in baptism we undertake to do our dut in confirmation we receive strength to do it; in baptism promise for us, in confirmation we undertake for ourselves, w our godfathers and godmothers of their burden, and take it our own shoulders, together with the advantage of the prayers bishop and all the church made then on our behalf; in baptis give up our names to Christ, but in confirmation we put our s the profession, and God puts His seal to the promise. It is remarkable what S. Paul says of the beginnings of our being tians, ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, 'the word of the beginni Christ;' Christ begins with us, He gives us His word and admi and we by others' hands are brought in; τύπος διδαχῆς εἰς ὃν δόθητε[m], it is 'the form of doctrine unto which ye were deliv Cajetan observes right, that this is a new and emphatical w speaking: we are wholly immerged in our fundamentals; things are delivered to us, but we are delivered up unto these. is done in baptism and catechism; and what was the event o "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of right ness[n]." Your baptism was for the remission of sins there, and ye were made free from that bondage; and what then? why th the next place, when ye came to consummate this proce when the baptized was confirmed, then he became a serva righteousness, that is, then the Holy Ghost descended upon you enabled you to walk in the Spirit; then the seed of God was thrown into your hearts by a celestial influence. *Spiritus sancti baptisterio plenitudinem tribuit ad innocentiam, sed in confirma*

[1] [John vii. 38.] [m] [Rom. vi. 17.] [n] [ver. 18.

augmentum præstat ad gratiam, said Eusebius Emissenus[m]: in baptism we are made innocent, in confirmation we receive the increase of the Spirit of grace; in that we are regenerated unto life, in this we are strengthened unto battle. *Dono sapientiæ illuminamur, ædificamur, erudimur, instruimur, confirmamur*[n], *ut illam sancti Spiritus vocem audire possimus, Intellectum tibi dabo, et instruam te in hac via qua gradieris,* said P. Melchiades[o], "we are enlightened by the gift of wisdom, we are built up, taught, instructed and confirmed, so that we may hear that voice of the Holy Spirit, 'I will give unto thee an understanding heart, and teach thee in the way wherein thou shalt walk:'" For so,

> Signari populos effuso pignore sancto,
> Mirandæ virtutis opus[p],——

'it is a work of great and wonderful power when the holy pledge of God is poured forth upon the people.' This is that power from on high which first descended in Pentecost, and afterward was ministered by prayer and imposition of the apostolical and episcopal hands, and comes after the other gift of remission of sins. *Vides quod non simpliciter hoc fit, sed multa opus est virtute ut detur Spiritus sanctus, non enim idem est assequi remissionem peccatorum et accipere virtutem illam,* said S. Chrysostom[q]; 'you see that this is not easily done, but there is need of much power from on high to give the Holy Spirit, for it is not all one to obtain remission of sins and to have received this virtue or power from above.' *Quamvis enim continuo transituris sufficiant regenerationis beneficia, victuris tamen necessaria sunt confirmationis auxilia,* said Melchiades[r]; 'although to them that die presently the benefits of regeneration (baptismal) are sufficient, yet to them that live the auxiliaries of confirmation are necessary.' For according to the saying of S. Leo[s] in his epistle to Nicetas the bishop of Aquileia, commanding that heretics returning to the church should be confirmed with invocation of the Holy Spirit and imposition of hands, 'they have only received the form of baptism *sine sanctificationis virtute,* without the virtue of sanctification;' meaning that this is the proper effect of confirmation. For in short, "although the newly-listed soldiers in human warfare are enrolled in the number of them that are to fight, yet they are not brought to battle till they be more trained and exercised: so although by baptism every one is ascribed into the catalogue of believers, yet he receives more strength and grace for the sustaining and overcoming the temptations of the flesh, the world, and the devil, only by imposition of the

[m] Serm. de Pentecoste. [The words are from Melchiades, ad episc. Hispan. c. 2.—Hallier (p. 69) quotes them from 'Eusebius Emiss. seu auctor ser. de Pentecoste.']

[n] [leg. 'consummamur.']

[o] [ut in not. m, supra.]—Habetur apud Gratian. de consecrat. dist. 5. c. 'Spiritus S.' [The chapter in Gratian contains the preceding passage from Melchiades, but not this.]

[p] Tertul. advers. Marcion., lib. i. car. c. 3. [p. 630.]

[q] Hom. xviii. in Act. [tom. ix. p. 147.]

[r] [ut in not. m, supra.]

[s] [ep. lxxix. cap. 7. p. 148.]

bishop's hands." They are words which I borrowed from a late synod at Rhemes[t]. That's the first remark of blessing; in confirmation we receive strength to do all that which was for us undertaken in baptism: for the apostles themselves (as the holy fathers observe) were timorous in the faith until they were confirmed in Pentecost, but after the reception of the Holy Ghost they waxed valiant in the faith and in all their spiritual combats.

2. In confirmation we receive the Holy Ghost as the earnest of our inheritance, as the seal of our salvation: *καλοῦμεν σφραγῖδα, ὡς σωτήρησιν καὶ τῆς δεσποτείας σημείωσιν*, saith Gregory Nazianzen[u]; 'we therefore call it a seal or signature, as being a guard and custody to us, and a sign of the Lord's dominion over us.' The confirmed person is *πρόβατον ἐσφραγισμένον*, 'a sheep that is marked,' which thieves do not so easily steal and carry away. To the same purpose are those words of Theodoret[x], *Ἀνάμνησον σαυτὸν τῆς ἱερᾶς μυσταγωγίας, ἐν ᾗ οἱ τελούμενοι, μετὰ τὴν ἄρνησιν τοῦ τυράννου, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Βασιλέως ὁμολογίαν, οἱονεὶ σφραγῖδά τινα βασιλικὴν δέχονται τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μύρου τὸ χρίσμα, ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τῷ μύρῳ τὴν ἀόρατον τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος χάριν ὑποδεχόμενοι*· 'remember that holy mystagogy, in which they who were initiated, after the renouncing that tyrant (the devil and all his works) and the confession of the true king (Jesus Christ), have received the chrism of spiritual unction like a royal signature, by that unction, as in a shadow, perceiving the invisible grace of the most Holy Spirit.' That is, in confirmation we are sealed for the service of God and unto the day of redemption; then it is that the seal of God is had by us, "The Lord knoweth who are His." *Quomodo vero dices, Dei sum, si notas non produxeris?* said S. Basil[y], 'How can any man say I am God's sheep unless he produce the marks?' *Signati estis Spiritu promissionis per sanctissimum divinum Spiritum, Domini grex effecti sumus*, said Theophylact[z]. 'When we are thus sealed by the most holy and divine Spirit of promise, then we are truly of the Lord's flock, and marked with His seal:' that is, when we are rightly confirmed, then He descends into our souls; and though He does not operate (it may be) presently, but as the reasonable soul works in its due time and by the order of nature, by opportunities and new fermentations and actualities; so does the Spirit of God; when He is brought into use, when He is prayed for with love and assiduity, when He is caressed tenderly, when He is used lovingly, when we obey His motions readily, when we delight in His words greatly, then we find it true that the soul had a new life put into her, a principle of perpetual actions: but the 'tree planted by the water's side' does not presently bear fruit, but 'in its due season.' By this Spirit we are then sealed; that whereas God hath laid up an inherit-

[t] [Bochell. decret. eccles. Gall., lib. ii. tit. 5. cap. 11.]

[u] [Orat. xl. cap. 4. tom. i. p. 693 B.]

[x] Comment. in Cantic., c. i. 2. [tom. ii. part. 1. p. 30.]

[y] In adhort. ad baptis. [tom. ii. p. 117 B.]

[z] [leg. 'Theodoret.' in Eph. i. 13.]

ance for us in the kingdom of heaven, and in the faith of that we must live and labour, to confirm this faith God hath given us this pledge, the Spirit of God is a witness to us, and tells us by His holy comforts, by the peace of God and the quietness and refreshments of a good conscience, that God is our Father, that we are His sons and daughters, and shall be co-heirs with Jesus in His eternal kingdom. In baptism we are made the sons of God, but we receive the witness and testimony of it in confirmation. This is ὁ παράκλητος, the Holy Ghost the Comforter, this is He whom Christ promised and did send in Pentecost, and was afterwards ministered and conveyed by prayer and imposition of hands: and by this Spirit He makes the confessors bold and the martyrs valiant, and the tempted strong, and the virgins to persevere, and widows to sing His praises and His glories. And this is that excellency which the church of God called the Lord's seal, and teaches to be imprinted in confirmation; τὸ τέλειον φυλακτήριον, τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου, 'a perfect phylactery or guard, even the Lord's seal,' so Eusebius[a] calls it.

I will not be so curious as to enter into a discourse of the philosophy of this; but I shall say that they who are curious in the secrets of nature, and observe external signatures in stones, plants, fruits and shells, of which naturalists make many observations and observe strange effects, and the more internal signatures in minerals and living bodies of which chymists discourse strange secrets, may easily, if they please, consider that it is infinitely credible that in higher essences, even in spirits, there may be signatures proportionable, wrought more immediately and to greater purposes by a divine hand. I only point at this, and so pass it over, as (it may be) not fit for every man's consideration.

And now if any man shall say, "We see no such things as you talk of, and find the confirmed people the same after as before, no better and no wiser, not richer in gifts, not more adorned with graces, nothing more zealous for Christ's kingdom, not more comforted with hope, or established by faith, or built up with charity; they neither speak better nor live better;" what then, does it therefore follow that the Holy Ghost is not given in confirmation? Nothing less: for is not Christ given us in the sacrament of the Lord's supper? do not we receive His body and His blood? are we not made all one with Christ, and He with us? And yet it is too true, that when we arise from that holy feast, thousands there are that find no change.—But there are in this two things to be considered;—

One is, that the changes which are wrought upon our souls are not after the manner of nature, visible and sensible, and with observation. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation:" for it is within you, and is only discerned spiritually, and produces its effects by the method of heaven, and is first apprehended by faith, and is endeared by charity, and at last is understood by holy and

[a] [leg. 'Clem. Alex.'] apud Euseb. [hist. eccles., iii. 23.]

kind experiences. And in this there is no more objection against confirmation than against baptism, or the Lord's supper, or any other ministry evangelical.

The other thing is this: if we do not find the effects of the Spirit in confirmation it is our faults. For He is received by moral instruments, and is intended only as a help to our endeavours, to our labours and our prayers, to our contentions and our mortifications, to our faith and to our hope, to our patience and to our charity. *Non adjuvari dicitur qui nihil facit,* 'he that does nothing cannot be said to be helped.' Unless we in these instances do our part of the work, it will be no wonder if we lose His part of the co-operation and supervening blessing. He that comes under the bishop's hands to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, will come with holy desires and a longing soul, with an open hand and a prepared heart; he will purify the house of the Spirit for the entertainment of so divine a guest; he will receive Him with humility, and follow Him with obedience, and delight Him with purities: and he that does thus, let him make the objection if he can, and tell me,—Does he say that Jesus is the Lord? He cannot say this but by the Holy Ghost. Does he love his brother? If he does, then the Spirit of God abides in him. Is Jesus Christ formed in him? does he live by the laws of the Spirit? does he obey His commands? does he attend His motions? hath he no earnest desires to serve God? If he have not, then in vain hath he received either baptism or confirmation: but if he have, it is certain that of himself he cannot do these things; he cannot of himself think a good thought. Does he therefore think well? That is from the Holy Spirit of God.

To conclude this enquiry. "The Holy Ghost is promised to all men to profit withal[b];" that's plain in scripture. Confirmation, or prayer and imposition of the bishop's hand, is the solemnity and rite used in scripture for the conveying of that promise, and the effect is felt in all the sanctifications and changes of the soul; and he that denies these things hath not faith, nor the true notices of religion, or the spirit of christianity. Hear what the scriptures yet further say in this mystery. "Now He which confirmeth or stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts[c]." Here is a description of the whole mysterious part of this rite. God is the author of the grace: the apostles and all Christians are the suscipients, and receive this grace: by this grace we are adopted and incorporated into Christ; God hath anointed us; that is, He hath given us this unction from above, He hath 'sealed us by His spirit,' made us His own, bored our ears through, made us free by His perpetual service, and hath done all these things in token of a greater; He hath given us His spirit to testify to us that He will give us of His glory. These words of S. Paul, besides that they evidently contain in them the

[b] [1 Cor. xii. 7.] [c] [2 Cor. i. 21, 22.]

spiritual part of this ritual, are also expounded of the rite and sacramental itself by S. Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact, that I may name no more. For in this mystery *Christos nos efficit, et misericordiam Dei nobis annunciat per Spiritum sanctum,* said S. John Damascene[d], 'He makes us His anointed ones, and by the Holy Spirit He declares His eternal mercy towards us.' *Nolite tangere christos meos,* 'Touch not Mine anointed ones.' For when we have this signature of the Lord upon us the devils cannot come near to hurt us, unless we consent to their temptations and drive the Holy Spirit of the Lord from us.

§ 7. Of preparation to confirmation, and the circumstances of receiving it.

If confirmation have such gracious effects, why do we confirm little children, whom in all reason we cannot suppose to be capable and receptive of such graces? It will be no answer to this if we say, that this very question is asked concerning the baptism of infants, to which as great effects are consequent, even pardon of all our sins and the new birth and regeneration of the soul unto Christ; for in these things the soul is wholly passive, and nothing is required of the suscipient but that he put in no bar against the grace, which because infants cannot do, they are capable of baptism: but it follows not that therefore they are capable of confirmation, because this does suppose them such as to need new assistances, and is a new profession, and a personal undertaking, and therefore requires personal abilities, and cannot be done by others, as in the case of baptism. The aids given in confirmation are in order to our contention and our danger, our temptation and spiritual warfare; and therefore it will not seem equally reasonable to confirm children as to baptize them.

To this I answer, that in the primitive church confirmation was usually administered at the same time with baptism; for we find many records that when the office of baptism was finished and the baptized person divested of the white robe, the person was carried again to the bishop to be confirmed, as I have already shewn out of Dionysius[e] and divers others. The reasons why anciently they were ministered immediately after one another is, not only because the most of them that were baptized were of years to choose their religion, and did so, and therefore were capable of all that could be consequent to baptism, or annexed to it, or ministered with it, and therefore were also at the same time communicated as well as confirmed; but also because the solemn baptisms were at solemn times of the year, at Easter only and Whitsuntide, and only in the cathedral or bishop's church in the chief city, whither when the catechumens came, and

[d] Lib. iv. De fide, c. 10. [al. 9. tom. i. p. 262.]

[e] Cap. iv. part. 3. De eccles. hier.—Melchiad. epist. ad episc. Hispan.—Ordo Rom. cap. De die sabbati S. Pasch.—Alcuin. De divin. offic., c. 19. [vid. pp. 628 sq. 647, 657, supra.]

had the opportunity of the bishop's presence, they took the advantage *ut sacramento utroque renascantur*, as S. Cyprian's[f] expression is, that they might be regenerated by both the mysteries, and they also had the third added, viz., the holy eucharist.

This simultaneous ministration hath occasioned some few of late to mistake confirmation for a part of baptism, but no distinct rite, or of distinct effect, save only that it gave ornament and complement or perfection to the other. But this is infinitely confuted by the very first ministry of confirmation in the world: for there was a great interval between S. Philip's baptizing and the apostle's confirming the Samaritans; where also the difference is made wider by the distinction of the minister; a deacon did one, none but an apostle and his successor a bishop could do the other: and this being of so universal a practice and doctrine in the primitive church, it is a great wonder that any learned men could suffer an error in so apparent a case. It is also clear in two other great remarks of the practice of the primitive church: the one is of them who were baptized in their sickness, the οἱ ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβάνοντες, καὶ εἶτα ἀναστάντες, when they recovered they were commanded to address themselves to the bishop to be confirmed; which appears in the thirty-eighth canon of the council of Eliberis, and the forty-sixth canon of the council of Laodicea, which I have before cited upon other occasions: the other is that of heretics returning to the church, who were confirmed not only long after baptism, but after their apostasy and their conversion.

For although episcopal confirmation was the enlargement of baptismal grace, and commonly administered the same day, yet it was done by interposition of distinct ceremonies, and not immediately in time. Honorius Augustodunensis[g] tells, that when the baptized on the eighth day had laid aside their mitres or proper habit used in baptism, then they were usually confirmed or consigned with chrism in the forehead by the bishop. And when children were baptized irregularly or besides the ordinary way in villages and places distant from the bishop, confirmation was deferred, said Durandus. And it is certain that this affair did not last long without variety: sometimes they ministered both together; sometimes at greater, sometimes at lesser distances; and it was left indifferent in the church to do the one or the other, or the third, according to the opportunity and the discretion of the bishop.

But afterward in the middle and descending ages it grew to be a question, not whether it were lawful or not, but which were better, to confirm infants or to stay to their childhood or to their riper years. Aquinas[h], Bonaventure[i] and some others say it is best that they be confirmed in their infancy, *quia dolus non est, nec obicem*

[f] [vid. p. 624, not. e, supra.]

[g] Vide Cassandrum, Schol. ad hymn. eccl. [p. 218.—opp. fol. Par. 1616.]

[h] [3 sum. q. lxxii. art. 8.]

[i] [In lib. iv. dist. 7. art. 3. qu. tom. v. part. 2. p. 97.]

ponunt, they are then without craft, and cannot hinder the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. And indeed it is most agreeable with the primitive practice, that if they were baptized in infancy they should then also be confirmed; according to that of the famous epistle of Melchiades to the bishops of Spain[j], *Ita conjuncta sunt hæc duo sacramenta, ut ab invicem, nisi morte præveniente, non possint separari, et unum sine altero rite perfici non potest.* Where although he expressly affirms the rites to be two, yet unless it be in cases of necessity they are not to be severed, and one without the other is not perfect; which in the sense formerly mentioned is true, and so to be understood, that "to him who is baptized and is not confirmed something very considerable is wanting, and therefore they ought to be joined, though not immediately, yet εὐχρόνως, according to reasonable occasions and accidental causes." But in this there must needs be a liberty in the church, not only for the former reasons, but also because the apostles themselves were not confirmed till after they had received the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

Others therefore say that to confirm them of riper years is with more edification. The confession of faith is more voluntary, the election is wiser, the submission to Christ's discipline is more acceptable, and they have more need, and can make better use of their strengths then derived by the Holy Spirit of God upon them: and to this purpose it is commanded in the canon law that they who are confirmed should be *perfectæ ætatis*, 'of full age;' upon which the gloss[k] says, *Perfectum vocat forte duodecim annorum*, 'twelve years old was a full age, because at those years they might then be admitted to the lower services in the church.' But the reason intimated and implied by the canon is because of the preparation to it; "they must come fasting, and they must make public confession of their faith." And indeed that they should do so is matter of great edification, as also are the advantages of choice and other preparatory abilities and dispositions above mentioned. They are matter of edification, I say, when they are done; but then the delaying of them so long before they be done, and the wanting the aids of the Holy Ghost conveyed in that ministry, are very prejudicial, and are not matter of edification.

But therefore there is a third way, which the church of England and Ireland follows, and that is, that after infancy, but yet before they understand too much of sin, and when they can competently understand the fundamentals of religion, then it is good to bring them to be confirmed, that the Spirit of God may prevent their youthful sins, and Christ by His word and by His Spirit may enter and take possession at the same time. And thus it was in the church of England long since provided and commanded by the laws of king Edgar, cap. 15[l], *ut nullus*

A. D. 967.

[j] [cap. 2. p. 698.]

[k] De consecrat. dist. v. c. 'Ut jejuni.'

[sc. c. vi. col. 2224.]

[l] [Wilkins, Concil., tom. i. p. 226.]

ab episcopo confirmari diu nimium detrectarit, 'that none should too long put off his being confirmed by the bishop;' that is, as is best expounded by the perpetual practice almost ever since, as soon as ever by catechism and competent instruction they were prepared, it should not be deferred. If it have been omitted (as of late years it hath been too much) as we do in baptism, so in this also, it may be taken at any age, even after they have received the Lord's supper; as I observed before in the practice and example of the apostles themselves, which in this is an abundant warrant; but still the sooner the better. I mean after that reason begins to dawn; but ever it must be taken care of that the parents and godfathers, the ministers and masters, see that the children be catechized and well instructed in the fundamentals of their religion.

For this is the necessary preparation to the most advantageous reception of this holy ministry. *In ecclesiis potissimum Latinis non nisi adultiore ætate pueros admitti videmus, vel hanc certe ob causam, ut parentibus, susceptoribus et ecclesiarum præfectis, occasio detur pueros de fide, quam in baptismo professi sunt, diligentius instituendi et admonendi,* said the excellent Cassander[m]; 'in the Latin churches they admit children of some ripeness of age, that they may be more diligently taught and instructed in the faith. And to this sense agree S. Austin[n], Walafridus Strabo[o], Ruardus Lovaniensis[p], and Mr. Calvin[q].

For this was ever the practice of the primitive church, to be infinitely careful of catechizing those who came and desired to be admitted to this holy rite; they used exorcisms or catechisms to prepare them to baptism and confirmation. I said 'exorcisms or catechisms,' for they were the same thing; if the notion be new, yet I the more willingly declare it, not only to free the primitive church from the suspicion of superstition in using charms or exorcisms (according to the modern sense of the word) or casting of the devil out of innocent children, but also to remonstrate the perpetual practice of catechizing children in the eldest and best times of the church. Thus the greek scholiast upon Harmenopulus[r] renders the word ἐφορκιστὰς by κατηχητὰς, the primitive exorcist was the catechist; and Balsamon[s] upon the twenty-sixth canon of the council of Laodicea says that to exorcize is nothing but to catechize the unbelievers; Τινὲς ἐπεχείρουν ἐφορκίζειν, τουτέστι κατηχεῖν ἀπίστους, 'some undertook to exorcize, that is,' says he, 'to catechize the unbelievers:' and S. Cyril, in his preface to his catechisms[t], speaking to the *Illuminati, Festinent,* says he, *pedes tui ad catecheses audiendas, exorcismos studiose*

[m] Consultationis, cap. 9. [p. 936. fol. Par. 1616.]
[n] Serm. cxvi. In ramis palmarum. [al. serm. cclxvii. tom. v. append. col. 441.]
[o] De reb. ecclesiast., c. 26. [p. 964.]
[p] [De confirm. sc. in artic. xii.—opp. fol. Col. Agr. 1582. tom. ii. p. 140 sqq.]
[q] [See Cassander, as above, note m.]
[r] [Epit. s. canon. sect. i. tit. 9. Apud Leunclav. Jus Græcorum, p. 16.]
[s] [Bevereg. Synod., tom. i. p. 464.]
[t] [cap. ix. p. 7.]

suscipe, &c., 'let your feet run hastily to hear the catechisms, studiously receive the exorcisms, although thou beest already inspired and exorcized;' that is, although you have been already instructed in the mysteries, yet still proceed; 'for without exorcisms' or catechisms 'the soul cannot go forward, since they are divine and gathered out of the scriptures.' And the reason why these were called exorcisms he adds, 'because when the exorcists or catechists by the Spirit of God produce fear in your hearts, and do enkindle the Spirit as in a furnace, the devil flies away, and salvation and hope of life eternal does succeed:' according to that of the evangelist[u] concerning Christ, "they were astonished at His doctrine, for His word was with power;" and that of S. Luke concerning Paul and Barnabas[x], "the deputy, when he saw what was done, was astonished at the doctrine of the Lord;" it is the Lord's doctrine that hath the power to cast out devils and work miracles; catechisms are the best exorcisms: "let us therefore, brethren, abide in hope, and persevere in catechizings," saith S. Cyril[y], "although they be long, and produced with many words or discourses." The same also we find in S. Gregory Nazianzen[z], and S. Austin[a].

The use that I make of this notion is principally to be an exhortation to all of the clergy, that they take great care to catechize all their people, to bring up children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to prepare a holy seed for the service of God, to cultivate the young plants and to dress the old ones, to take care that those who are men in the world be not mere babes and uninstructed in Christ, and that they who are children in age may be wise unto salvation: for by this means we shall rescue them from early temptations, when being so prepared they are so assisted by a divine ministry; we shall weaken the devil's power, by which he too often and too much prevails upon uninstructed and unconfirmed youth. For *μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας*, 'confirmation is the firmament of our profession;' but we profess nothing till we be catechized. Catechizings are our best preachings, and by them we shall give the best accounts of our charges, while in behalf of Christ we make disciples, and take prepossession of infant understandings, and by this holy rite, by prayer and imposition of hands, we minister the Holy Spirit to them, and so prevent and disable the artifices of the devil; "for we are not ignorant of his devices," how he enters as soon as he can, and taking advantage of their ignorance and their passion, seats himself so strongly in their hearts and heads.

Turpius ejicitur quam non admittitur hostis[b],

It is harder to cast the devil out than to keep him out. Hence it is that the youth are so corrupted in their manners, so devilish in their

[u] [Luke iv. 32.]
[x] [Acts xiii. 12.]
[y] [ubi supra, p. 8.]
[z] Orat. de bapt. [orat. xl. cap. 27. tom. i. p. 712 E.]
[a] In psalm. lxviii. [? lxv. § 17. tom. iv. col. 651.]
[b] [Ovid., trist. v. 6. 13.]

natures, so cursed[a] in their conversation, so disobedient to parents, so wholly given to vanity and idleness; they learn to swear before they can pray, and to lie as soon as they can speak. It is not my sense alone, but was long since observed by Gerson[b] and Gulielmus Parisiensis[c], *propter cessationem confirmationis tepiditas grandior est in fidelibus, et fidei defensione;* there is a coldness and deadness in religion, and it proceeds from the neglect of confirmation rightly ministered, and after due preparations and dispositions. A little thing will fill a child's head; teach them to say their prayers, tell them the stories of the life and death of Christ, cause them to love the holy Jesus with their first love, make them afraid of a sin; let the principles which God hath planted in their very creation, the natural principles of justice and truth, of honesty and thankfulness, of simplicity and obedience, be brought into act and habit, and confirmation by the holy sermons of the gospel. If the guides of souls would have their people holy, let them teach holiness to their children, and then they will, at least, have a new generation unto God, better than this wherein we now live. They who are most zealous in this particular will with most comfort reap the fruit of their labours and the blessings of their ministry; and by the numbers which every curate presents to his bishop fitted for confirmation, he will in proportion render an account of his stewardship with some visible felicity. And let it be remembered, that in the last rubric of the office of confirmation in our liturgy it is made into a law, that "none should be admitted to the holy communion until such time as he could say the catechism and be confirmed;" which was also a law and custom in the primitive church, as appears in S. Dionysius his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and the matter of fact is notorious. Among the Helvetians they are forbidden to contract marriages before they are well instructed in the catechism; and in a late synod at Bourges[d], the curates are commanded to threaten all that are not confirmed, that they shall never receive the Lord's supper, nor be married. And in effect the same is of force in our church; for the married persons being to receive the sacrament at their marriage, and none are to receive but those that are confirmed, the same law obtains with us as with the Helvetians or the Synodus Bituricensis.

There is another little enquiry which I am not willing to omit; but the answer will not be long, because there is not much to be said on either side. Some enquire whether the holy rite of confirmation can be ministered any more than once. S. Austin[e] seems to be of opinion that it may be repeated. *Quid enim aliud est impositio manuum nisi oratio super hominem?* Confirmation is a solemn prayer

[a] [i. e. 'perverse, froward;' see p. 217, note e, above.]

[b] De exterminat. schism. [leg. 'De officio prælatorum,' &c. Opp. tom. iv. col. 103.—The reader on referring to the page will see how the mistake in reference arose.]

[c] [Apud Gerson. ubi supra.]

[d] [vid. p. 653. not. b, supra.]

[e] Lib. iii. de Bapt., c. 16. [tom. ix. col. 117.]

over a man; and if so, why it may not be reiterated can have nothing in the nature of the thing; and the Greeks do it frequently, but they have no warranty from the scripture, nor from any of their own ancient doctors. Indeed when any did return from heresy they confirmed them, as I have proved out of the first and second council of Arles, the council of Laodicea, and the second council of Sevil: but upon a closer intuition of the thing, I find they did so only to such who did not allow of confirmation in their sects, such as the Novatians and the Donatists. *Novatiani pœnitentiam a suo conventu arcent penitus, et iis qui ab ipsis tinguntur sacrum chrisma non præbent; quocirca qui ex hac hæresi corpori ecclesiæ conjunguntur benedicti patres ungi jusserunt:* so Theodoret[f]. For that reason only the Novatians were to be confirmed upon their conversion, because they had it not before. I find also they did confirm the converted Arians; but the reason is given in the first council of Arles[g], *quia propria lege utuntur*, 'they had a way of their own:' that is, as the gloss saith upon the canon *De Arianis, De consecrat. dist.* 4[h], their baptism was not in the name of the holy Trinity; and so their baptism being null, or at least suspected, to make all as sure as they could, they confirmed them. The same also is the case of the Bonosiaci in the second council of Arles, though they were (as some of the Arians also were) baptized in the name of the most holy Trinity; but it was a suspected matter, and therefore they confirmed them: but to such persons who had been rightly baptized and confirmed they never did repeat it. Πνεύματος ἁγίου σφραγὶδ δώῃ ἀνεξάλειπτον, 'the gift of the Spirit is an indelible seal,' saith S. Cyril[i]; ἀνεπιχείρητον S. Basil[k] calls it, it is 'inviolable.' They who did re-baptize, did also re-confirm. But as it was an error in S. Cyprian and the Africans to do the first, so was the second also, in case they had done it; for I find no mention expressly that they did the latter but upon the fore-mentioned accounts, and either upon supposition of the invalidity of their first pretended baptism, or their not using at all of confirmation in their heretical conventicles. But the repetition of confirmation is expressly forbidden[l] by the council of Tarracon, cap. 6, and by P. Gregory the second: and *Sanctum chrisma collatum et altaris honor propter consecrationem* (*quæ per episcopos tantum exercenda et conferenda sunt*) *evelli non queunt*, said the fathers in a council at Toledo[m], 'Confirmation and holy orders, which are to be given by bishops alone, can never be annulled, and therefore they can never be repeated.' And this relies upon those severe words of S. Paul, having spoken of "the foundation of the doctrine of baptisms and laying on of hands," he says, "if they fall away, they can

[f] Lib. iii. hæret. fabul. [cap. 5.]
[g] [can. 8. tom. i. col. 265.]
[h] [can. 109. col. 2197.]
[i] Cyril. Hieros. in procatech. [ad fin. p. 14 A.]
[k] [Hom. xiii. tom. ii. p. 117 D.]
[l] Apud Gratian. de consecrat., dist. v. cap. [8.] 'Dictum est,' et cap. [9.] 'De homine.' [col. 2224.]
[m] Concil. Toletan. viii. can. 7. [tom. iii. col 963.]

never be renewed[m];" that is, the ministry of baptism and confirmati can never be repeated. To Christians that sin after these minist tions there is only left a *νήψατε, expergiscimini*, that they 'arise fr slumber,' and stir up the graces of the Holy Ghost. Every m ought to be careful that he 'do not grieve the Holy Spirit;' but he does, yet let him not quench Him, for that is a desperate ca *Φύλαττε τὸν φυλακτικόν*· the Holy Spirit is the great conservati of the new life; only 'keep the keeper,' take care that the Spirit God do not depart from you: for the great ministry of the Spirit but once; for as baptism is, so is confirmation.

I end this discourse with a plain exhortation out of S. Ambros upon those words of S. Paul, "He that confirmeth us with you Christ is God;" *Repete quia accepisti signaculum spirituale, spiritu sapientiæ et intellectus, spiritum consilii atque virtutis, spiritum c nitionis atque pietatis, spiritum sancti timoris, et serva quod accepis signavit te Deus Pater, confirmavit te Christus Dominus;* 'Rememb that thou, who hast been confirmed, hast received the spiritu signature, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and godliness, t spirit of holy fear; keep what thou hast received: the Father ha sealed thee, and Christ thy Lord hath confirmed thee' by His divi Spirit, and He will never depart from thee, *εἰ μὴ δι' ἔργων φαυλ τητα ἡμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς ταύτης ἀποξενώσωμεν*[o], 'unless by evil works estrange Him from us.' The same advice is given by Prudentiu

> Cultor Dei, memento
> Te fontis et lavacri
> Rorem subisse sanctum,
> Et chrismate innotatum[q].

Remember how great things ye have received, and what God ha done for you: ye are of His flock and His militia; ye are now fight His battles, and therefore to put on His armour, and to impl His auxiliaries, and to make use of His strengths, and always to on His side against all His and all our enemies. But he that desi grace must not despise to make use of all the instruments of grace. F though God communicates His invisible Spirit to you, yet that He pleased to do it by visible instruments is more than He needs, but r more than we do need. And therefore since God descends to our i firmities, let us carefully and lovingly address ourselves to His or nances: that as we receive remission of sins by the washing of wat and the body and blood of Christ by the ministry of consecrat symbols; so we may receive the Holy Ghost *sub ducibus christia militiæ*, by the prayer and imposition of the bishop's hands, wh our Lord Jesus hath separated to this ministry. "For if you c roborate yourself by baptism" (they are the words of S. Greg

[m] [Heb. vi. 6.]
[n] [De myst., cap. vii. fin.]
[o] Zonar. in can. Laodicen. 48. [Beveregius Synod., tom. i. p. 476.]
[p] [Cathemer. hymn. vi. 125. p. 30
[q] ['innovatum' edd.]

Nazianzen[r]) "and then take heed for the future, by the most excellent and firmest aids consigning your mind and body with the unction from above" (viz. in the holy rite of confirmation) "with the Holy Ghost, as the children of Israel did with the aspersion on the door-posts in the night of the death of the first-born of Egypt, what (evil) shall happen to you?" meaning, that no evil can invade you: "and what aid shall you get? if you sit down, you shall be without fear; and if you rest, your sleep shall be sweet unto you." But if when ye have received the Holy Spirit you live not according to His divine principles, you will lose Him again; that is, you will lose all the blessing, though the impression does still remain till ye turn quite apostates: *In pessimis hominibus manebit, licet ad judicium*, saith S. Austin[s]; the Holy Ghost will remain, either as a testimony of your unthankfulness unto condemnation, or else as a seal of grace, and an earnest of your inheritance of eternal glory.

[r] Orat. in sanctum lavacrum. [orat. xl. cap. 15. tom. i. p. 701.]

[s] Lib. ii. contra lit. Petil., c. 104. [tom. ix. col. 293.]

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

CORRECTIONS.

P. 49, note q, should be [opp. p. 229 sqq.]
73, note o, read ἔνθα ἐστὶ.
96, note j, —— ἔστιν.
117, line 27, —— 'in the year 657,' add note [i.e. of the Spanish era, which was A.D. 38.]
123, line 26, —— τινὰς ἔστιν.
130, line 12, —— Ἀλεξανδρείαν.
— note n, —— ἑκκαίδεκα.
137, line 17, —— βούληται.
142, line 10, —— ἀτόποις.
174, line penult., —— ἀποδέδοται.
206, in note e,——Harduin, concil., tom. i. p. 793.]
208, line 38 sq., for [x] read [v], and dele [v].
263, line 1, —— ὡς.
301, line 2, —— εἶς.
342, line 18, —— ᾗδη.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
RENEWALS ONLY—TEL. NO. 642-3405
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC'D LD OCT 7[illegible] -4PM 4 7

SEP 6 1976 3 4

AUG 13 2005

APR 14 1977

SENT ON ILL

JUN 10 1994

U. C. BERKELEY

06/19/96

LD21A-60m-3,'70
(N5382s10)476-A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

LD 21A-50m-8,'61
(C1795s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C047431384

18737 BR 75
T26
V.5

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY